DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 221 949 EA 015 070

AUTHOR Bebermeyer, Ruth
TITLE Leadership for School Climate Improvement. A Working Paper Prepared for the Urban Education Network.
INSTITUTION CEMREL, Inc., St. Louis, Mo.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Mar 82
CONTRACT 400-80-0102
NOTE 130p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Environment; *Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; Inservice Education; *Leadership Qualities; *Leadership Training; Management Development; *Principals; Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; Program Improvement; Questionnaires

ABSTRACT

Pertinent research literature and existing practices in the area of leadership for school climate improvement are reviewed in this document. The report first turns to the literature to establish working concepts of "leadership" and "school climate," enumerating the major characteristics by which each concept is recognized. The processes for improving school climate are reviewed next and are described as varying less in general approach than in the degree of specificity with which they are detailed by their originators. Thirteen instruments for assessing school climate and a number of approaches and programs for providing leadership training are also outlined, preceding the author's short summation. Over 110 relevant documents are cited in the report's bibliography. The author also provides substantial supplementary material, including descriptions of 11 school climate improvement projects currently being conducted in school districts or at the state level across the country; a 14-page instrument for principals to use, either individually or in workshops, in assessing school climate, clarifying goals, and planning actions; and a series of 7 summary sheets addressing major points made in earlier portions of the document about leadership, the principal, and school climate. A newsletter containing information from the National Institute of Education about current research activity related to the principalship is appended. (PGD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED221949

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

[✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.]
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

EA 015 070

CEMREL, Inc.

LEADERSHIP FOR SCHOOL CLIMATE IMPROVEMENT

A Working Paper Prepared for
the Urban Education Network

by

Ruth Bebermeyer

Urban Education Program
CEMREL, Inc.
3120 59th Street
St. Louis, Missouri
Telephone: 314-781-2900

The work contained herein has been developed pursuant to Contract No. 400-80-0102 with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and welfare. The opinions expressed in this document do not necessarily reflect the position of the National Institute of Education, and no official endorsement by the Institute should be inferred.

March, 1982

CONTENTS

Foreword 1

Introduction 2

Leadership -- What It Is and How We Recognize Effective Leadership for School Improvement 5

School Climate -- What It Is and How We Recognize Desirable School Climate 20

School Climate Improvement:

Processes for Improving School Climate . . 27

Instruments for Assessing School Climate . 37

Leadership Training. 44

Summary 61

References 65

Descriptions of Some School Climate Improvement Efforts Currently Occurring in the Urban Education Network 74

Research-Based Staff Development Materials 88

Self-Study Unit for Principals 90

Summary Sheets -- Major Points:

The Principal Who Leads 105

Indicators of Good School Climate Suggested by Research 106

Suggested Components of the School Climate Improvement Process 107

Cautions To Be Considered in Assessing the Likelihood of Success 108

Questions To Consider When Choosing a School Climate Assessment Instrument . 110

Planners of Inservice for Principals Should Take Into Account 111

The Principal as Instructional Leader . 112

Appendix A -- Information from the National Institute of Education about Current Research Activity Related to the Principalship . 114

FOREWORD

This document is a product of the efforts of a Research and Development Utilization group self-selected from representatives to the Urban Education Network and its staff coordinator from CEMREL's Urban Education Program. This is one of several on-going groups in the Network, each of which focuses on a topic members have identified as high priority. The group activities typically include a review of pertinent research literature and of existing practices which serves as a basis for planning improvement efforts in participating agencies. In this instance, the priority topic is "leadership for school climate improvement."

In order to consider "leadership for school climate improvement" with any kind of precision, we need to establish some specificity of meaning for the terms involved. With that in mind, the portion of the paper devoted to reviewing the research is organized with an Introduction and three general sections: (1) Leadership--what it is and how we recognize effective leadership for school improvement, (2) School Climate--what it is and how we recognize desirable school climate, and (3) Improvement--processes for improving school climate, including descriptions of assessment instruments and models for leadership training currently in use. A bibliography and brief summary section concludes that portion of the paper. Sections which follow include (1) Descriptions of Some School Climate Improvement Projects Currently Occurring in the Urban Education Network and (2) Staff Development materials based on the information contained in the paper.

INTRODUCTION

The current educational context is one of increased complexity and reduced resources. It is a time in which immediate consensus can be rallied around few issues, in which public support for public schools seems modest, with voter rejection of any increase in spending for education a commonplace. In some sense, it is a time of reduced expectations as well, as indicated by the frequent admonitions to concentrate on the "basics," defined as reading, writing, and math.

The national economic, population and employment pictures have changed, and the life styles and values of many American youth have changed also. Some observers see educational institutions as paralyzed because goals are unclear and/or unshared. The educational system in general is more bureaucratic and regimented than ever before, and educators perceive little opportunity to shape the structure in which they must perform. Mandates from state and federal agencies for special services complicate the situation.

Tensions escalate among those with interest in schools; teachers' unions have grown in influence; issues of desegregation, mainstreaming, and bilingual education provoke strong emotions from parents and community. Sunshine laws and media exposure mean that school business must be conducted under stress not always conducive to clearest thinking and decision-making.

Even as finances decline, some schools (notably urban high schools, of which the number with over 2000 students doubled from 1965-1978) are too unwieldy for effective management. Add to that the continuing increase of new technology and knowledge and the problems are compounded further.

A critical factor is the fragmented nature of the principal's job. Several recent studies highlight this. An ethnographic study by four researchers at the University of Illinois at Chicago Circle looked at the nature of the work of sixteen elementary and secondary principals in the Chicago Public Schools and at the effect of the discretionary decision-making done by those principals. The study describes the principals' work day as "a tumble of events with little discernible rank-ordering of the importance of managerial activities." By comparison, managers in business make most of their decisions in scheduled, sit-down meetings very unlike the piecemeal, spontaneous activity required of principals. Nearly 80% of the days of both elementary and secondary principals in the Chicago study was spent in face-to-face interaction with staff and students.

Kent Peterson at the University of Chicago studied the work of elementary principals and stressed the great variety of their tasks, of the types of people with whom they interact, and of the emotionality in those interactions. He reported that principals do many very short tasks at a quick pace, and that their longer activities are likely to be less than an hour in duration and likely to revolve around resolving conflicts.

Nancy Pitner of the University of Oregon also emphasizes the demands made on principals to think and speak on their feet and to do "scrambled" work with little time between deadlines.

It is little wonder that school leaders feel overwhelmed in these greatly complex environments. Many urban principals have been promoted through the ranks with minimal training for the kind of situations they are now facing. At least ten times as many administrators are in service as are preparing for service; preservice training at universities is often out of sync with the demands of the moment by four or five years because higher education institutions tend also to be resistant to change. In that context, inservice training for principals and others in leadership positions becomes even more important. At the same time, topics of inservice currently available generally focus on management skills or contemporary issues without addressing the broader question of how the principal can be instrumental in improving the school situation. It is to that broader question that this document is addressed.

LEADERSHIP--WHAT IT IS AND HOW WE RECOGNIZE EFFECTIVE LEADERSHIP FOR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

Leadership is a somewhat elusive concept, and researchers have attempted to define it sometimes in terms of personal traits, sometimes in terms of situational circumstances, and sometimes in terms of functions. Balderson (1975) says simply that a leader is somebody whom people follow. Another way of saying it is that a leader is someone who helps other people get things done. Others suggest that a leader is merely a person in a situation favorable to leadership, and they point out that in any group the leadership function usually passes among the members depending on who has skills pertinent to the problem at hand.

Some use the terms "leader" and "administrator" interchangeably. Novotney and Tye (1973) differentiate between the two terms in what is perhaps the most frequently encountered distinction: an administrator is somebody who uses existing structures and procedures to reach institutional goals; a leader creates new structures or procedures to reach those goals. Wayson (in Erickson and Reller, 1979) defines leadership as any act that helps a group or organization reach its goals and indicates that one can be at once a good administrator and a good leader. Presumably a good leader chooses to use existing procedures and structures if they work well, and initiates new ones only if they do not. Perhaps the critical issue is how--on what basis--the person makes decisions either to do things the way they have been done before or to do them differently. And related to that is whether or not the person has the skills to implement innovative processes or procedures once the decision has been made to do so. Kelley (1980) says, "Leadership for climate improvement consists of skills in (a) responding to concerns, expectations, and conditions which do exist or (b) initiating new expectations and conditions." He further asserts that, in order to be ready to exercise such skills, one needs both physical and mental health;

more specifically, one needs feelings that one's life and life's roles are both productive and satisfying.

Zigarmi (1981) maintains that "there is no normative (best) style of leadership and says that "successful leaders are those who can adapt their leader behavior to the needs of their followers and the situation." He emphasizes that leader behavior should not be thought of as a one-dimensional continuum (autocratic or democratic). He cites the leadership studies by the Bureau of Business Research at the Ohio State University which, after observation of leaders' behavior in a wide variety of situations, concluded that most leader activity could be classified into two categories: "initiating structure" and "consideration." Those concepts were defined as follows:

> "Initiating Structure -- the extent to which a leader is likely to organize and define the relationships between themselves and the members of his/her group (followers); to explain what activities each is to do, and when, where, and how tasks are to be accomplished --by endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and ways of getting jobs done."

> "Consideration -- the extent to which a leader is likely to maintain personal relationships between him/herself and the members of his/her group (followers) by opening up channels of communication, giving subordinates an opportunity to use their potential--characterized by socio-emotional support, friendship, mutual trust, and respect for followers' ideas."

The mix of these two types of behavior was found to vary considerably, with no specific style dominant among "successful" leaders. The Ohio State Model, then, can be shown as a four-quadrant figure in which a particular leader behavior may show low structure and high consideration, low structure and low consideration, high structure and low consideration, and high structure and high consideration. Zigarmi says that the choice of successful leader behavior involves diagnosing the developmental level (maturity) of "followers" when they are asked to perform role-related tasks. He cites Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership Model (described in detail by P. Hersey and K. Blanchard in *Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources*, published in 1977 by Prentice-Hall) which defines follower maturity in relation to a specific task along the three dimensions of (1) capacity to set high yet achieveable goals, (2) willingness/ability to take responsibility, and (3) task-relevant education and/or experience. It is important to emphasize that this way of looking at maturity avoids global characterizations about an individual's maturity or immaturity, but recognizes that any human being will be mature in relation to some tasks and immature in relation to others.

Using this Situational Leadership theory, Zigarmi suggests that appropriate leader behavior requires less structure and increasing consideration as follower maturity increases, until a point is reached where the need for overt consideration behavior also decreases. Zigarmi's use of these theories in implementing a staff development program for administrators related to school climate will be described in the section of this paper on Leadership Training.

Many researchers (Kelley, Valentine, Valenti, Washington, and others) indicate that the principal is the key to school climate improvement and is the person most responsible and accountable for it. Washington (1980) maintains that success or failure in school climate depends mostly on the basic assumptions that the principal holds about the people with whom s/he works--whether they must be threatened with punishment or attracted by reward in order to perform well or whether they are likely to be self-motivated, conscientious people. Recent studies point out that the tie between principal behavior and student achievement is still unknown, and that the connections which have been proposed are correlational at this stage of the research. The study of Chicago principals cited earlier concluded that, although conventional wisdom specifies that the principal's primary job is the evaluation and improvement of instruction, in actuality principals spend very little time observing teaching in the classroom and generally carry out their instructional leadership by indirection. That indirection attempts to manage the school community so that it can be conducive to learning by such practices as encouraging staff and students to strive for exemplary performance and removing disruptive students from classrooms.

Bruce Howell (1981), discussing the findings from three surveys (two conducted in Arkansas and Oklahoma and one conducted nationally) asserts that the principal "hasn't had the opportunity to concentrate on instruction as a primary activity for thirty years!" He cites as reasons the problems created by the increase of student mobility after World War II, the technological knowledge explosion, the onslaught of federal funds and paperwork in the 60s, and the time required at the negotiations table and with desegregation activities during the 70s. Howell concludes, "today's principal is engaging in crisis management and general operation...the perceptive contemporary principal simply can't step over a fight in the hall or ignore paperwork deadlines and proceed to the science curriculum meeting."

Howell's point is undoubtedly well taken, but some principals do manage to exhibit instructional leadership. Although research reported by Little (1981) focused on the relationship of school success and staff development (in a large urban district engaged in desegregation), it contains information about the relationship of principal behavior and school academic success which is pertinent here. The report identifies four types of practices that so clearly distinguished the more successful from the less successful schools studied that they were termed "critical practices of adaptability." The principal, by virtue both of office and of performance, was a key figure in establishing and maintaining the norms within which those practices could occur: (1) expectations for shared work: a norm of collegiality, and (2) expectations for analysis, evaluation, and experimentation: a norm of continuous improvement.

The four types of practice have to do with teachers engaging in frequent, continuous, and increasingly concrete and precise talk about teaching practice; the teachers and administrators frequently observing each other teaching and providing each other with useful evaluations of their teaching; the teachers and administrators planning, designing, researching, evaluating and preparing teaching materials together; and the teachers and administrators teaching each other the practice of teaching. The report says, "In successful and adaptable schools, interaction about teaching is consciously and steadily focused on practice, on what teachers do, with what aims, in what situations, with what materials, and with what apparent results. The focus on practice makes the interactions more immediately useful and therefore more likely to be sustained. And crucially, a focus, on practices as distinct from teachers helps to preserve self-respect and eliminate barriers to discussion; the utility of a practice is thus separated from the competence of a teacher."

Principals can promote those norms and practices in four primary ways: by announcing, enacting, sanctioning, and defending expectations for precisely those practices as central features of the school's work. The principal states expectations for teachers' performance that overtly favor collegial, analytical, and experimental work. Shared work, shared talk, frank review of present practice and investigation of alternatives are expected, and those expectations are made clear early in the school year and then with some regularity throughout the year. The principal models collegiality and continuing effort to improve in his/her own behavior, which means that his/her daily interactions with teachers reflect reciprocity and interdependence and s/he is visibly involved in careful description, analysis, interpretation, and evaluation of practice. The practice of reciprocity (mutual contribution to aims, perspectives, methods) is particularly important in those interactions and evaluations where the subjects are a potential threat to teachers' status and self-esteem. Through their control of resources, principals build or destroy norms of collegiality and experimentation. They control internal resources/rewards related to schedules, assignments, budgets, and meeting agenda. They control teacher access to outside resources by decisions about release time, consultants, and the like, and they evaluate teacher performance. Further, principals have some power to defend staff engaged in collegial, experimental efforts against external pressures from "the system" and, perhaps to a lesser extent, from internal pressure by staff members who are less committed to such efforts.

Wiggins (1971) maintains that the organizational climate affects the principal more than the principal affects the climate. His study showed that the expectations of staff and district tend to dominate the principal's personality, and to dominate more the longer a principal stays in a school. In spite of this pessimistic finding, Wiggins still seems to believe that such a situation can be changed, and most research seems to support the assertion that no change effort can succeed in the face of opposition from the principal and probably cannot endure even in the face of neutrality from the principal. Rosenblum and Jastrzab, in The Role of the Principal in Change, point out that no other position in the educational system involves working closely each day with students, teachers and parents. By the same token, no other position offers as much hope for exerting vital influence on school life.

The eight case studies in Why Do Some Urban Schools Succeed? each singled out the principal as a critical factor to the progress in student achievement. Neither time on the job or sex of the individual had a direct relationship with their effectiveness as principals in these schools. What did seem to relate to effectiveness was staff input into the principal's decision-making, decentralized staff selection (the principal hand-picked his/her staff from candidates screened by the district personnel office), the principal's interest in staff and students, high expectations and outcome-orientation, clear communication of those expectations, and support of teachers on student disciplinary matters. Typical statements from "experts" commenting on the case studies reflect the widespread opinion about the principal's crucial role. They referred to the principal's ability to use external political and organizational structures to support in-school programs and policies as critical to success. A typical comment was, "Within the school, effective principals enable teachers to take teaching seriously and to function effectively within their classrooms." Principals were seen to "enable" teachers by motivating and telling them to concentrate on teaching, by minimizing administrative interruptions in the classroom, and by obtaining the resources--material, political, parental and financial support--that teachers needed to do their job well.

Williams (1980), writing in Time to Learn, discusses the principal's role in implementing educational change, and divides that role into three categories: "knowledgeable colleague," "process monitor," and "supportive leader."

As knowledgeable colleague, the principal must be thoroughly acquainted with the substance of the change desired and the implications for school, classroom, pupils and teachers. S/he should know about the research relative to the proposed innovation, and should know the weaknesses as well as the strengths of that research. Having that knowledge will help to prevent the kind of overenthusiastic push for adoption of a change that may eventually discredit it.

As process monitor, the principal needs to understand the school as social system and be skilled at implementing innovation in that context. Relative to this, Williams discusses findings from the I/D/E/A/ Study of Educational Change and School Improvement and the RAND Corporation study of Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change. Those studies emphasize that educational innovation does not succeed unless the schools' faculty and staff agree that it is important enough to merit their devotion of energy and resources--unless, in other words, they assume "ownership" of the effort. The principal's role in building this ownership is, in Williams words, "to develop a decisionmaking structure that allows those who will be affected by the innovation to discuss the proposed innovation openly, freely, and thoroughly and come to a collective conclusion about whether to and how best to adopt it." This kind of process is time-consuming, and there is often a temptation to get some kind of superficial agreement and then rush into an implementation attempt which is likely to fail because fundamental issues which should have been resolved earlier arise and erode support for the effort.

The principal as process monitor also needs to provide for "mutual adaptation"--the proposed innovation and the school must adapt to each other if a happy "fit" is to occur. Each school has a unique set of characteristics that dictate when and how changes should be made, and these must be taken into consideration.

The principal as supportive leader provides materials, conditions and personnel critical to successful use of a desired innovation. This may mean that s/he must approach central office administrators in an effort to obtain resources and district support for the implementation process. District level administrators play a critical role in encouraging and sustaining their principals' risk-taking for educational improvement. If the rewards from central office go to those who "play it safe," and if district administrators do not verbally and by their actions value risk-taking, it is not to be expected that principals will indulge in much of it. Central office administrators also have a role to play in supporting and protecting principals if innovation attempts are not immediately and visibly productive or when there is significant opposition to projects, just as principals must play that role in supporting and protecting teachers. Over and over again both experience and research remind us that most improvement efforts take time, people involved in them need time to find out what does and does not work and to make adjustments as they try new ways, and yet that fact is often overlooked. The principal and the central office administrators can remember that fact and fend off demands for project evaluation before the project has had a reasonable time to succeed. They can also insist that any evaluation that is done accounts for the complexities of the situation.

Zigarmi emphasizes the role of central administration in supporting principals' efforts to develop their leadership skills. He suggests that central office administrators can demonstrate their commitment to leadership training by taking that training along with principals, can help in providing follow-up support by making sure that in-house staff developers have skills and rapport necessary to provide that support, and by recognizing and congratulating principals when data shows that they are held in very positive regard by their staffs.

Blumberg and Greenfield (1980) summarize the characteristics of principals who "lead" as follows:

1. an ability to make things happen, to operationalize goals through long-term strategy and day-to-day activities
2. a willingness to welcome new ideas without feeling threatened

3. a high tolerance for ambiguity
4. an ability to test the levels of interorganizational and interpersonal systems they encounter, including a willingness to take proactive stances
5. sensitivity to the dynamics of power
6. an ability to approach problem situations from a highly analytical perspective
7. a willingness to "take charge"

Kelley (1980) lists some awarenesses and abilities that are critical to effective leadership for climate improvement, whether the leader is a principal in a school or a teacher in a classroom:

1. awareness of the conditions and events which influence both personal and professional attitudes, beliefs and behaviors;
2. awareness of the expectations which are held of others and knowledge of whether or not others understand those expectations;
3. awareness of available responses to conditions or events which are present but which cannot be controlled and must be coped with;
4. ability to plan, initiate, and implement events or changes in conditions to influence those which can be changed;
5. ability to make long-range plans for maintenance and improvement of conditions and events which influence quality of outcomes attained by students.

Combining the findings of the previously mentioned researchers and others (Edmonds, Washington, Kunz and Hoy, Huge, Valentine, Tate, Gorton and McIntyre, Bogue, Wayson, Sexton and Switzer, Kelley, Bickel and Qualls, Cunningham and others) produces a fairly consistent list of indicators of effective educational leadership behavior. (While most of the literature reviewed dealt with behavior of principals and other administrators, the behaviors identified are often applicable to classroom teachers as well.) The person who leads in the creation and

15

maintenance of a productive and satisfying school climate (1) takes initiative, (2) uses a decision-making process which involves input from those affected by the decision, (3) demonstrates consideration for those with whom s/he works, (4) communicates openly and encourages others to do so, (5) establishes and maintains well-defined structures, (6) uses a logical, clear problem-solving process, and (7) demonstrates and communicates high expectations for self and others. In the paragraphs that follow, we will look more specifically at each of these behaviors.

The effective leader demonstrates initiative; s/he gets things started. "The principal is the prime mover within the school, the initiator of a series of linked events that result in positive change," says one of the interviewees in Why Do Some Urban Schools Succeed? S/he is not afraid to test the system and is not willing to be a pawn of it. Rosenblum and Jastrzab point out in The Role of the Principal in Change that many principals function at the lower limits of the scope and responsibility of their position because their knowledge of the characteristics of the system is incomplete and faulty, they lack the vision or the administrative and human relation skills to take charge in a positive way. Leadership is not without its risks and the system does not always reward the risktaker. The study of principals in Chicago found that a number of them practiced what the researchers called "creative insubordination" or "civilized disobedience" in dealing with central administration. The insubordination took the form of ignoring, deliberately misunderstanding, or outright disobeying orders which the principal believed to be counterproductive to the functioning of his or her school.

There is general agreement that the effective leader implements a process of participative decision-making, or, in a sense, voluntary sharing of power. Research suggests that power is not lessened by sharing it; indeed, supervisors who allow themselves to be influenced by subordinates have, in turn, more influence over them. Obviously, a person's ability to share power depends on his or her holding a basic assumption that people tend to act in responsible ways and need not be coerced into doing their jobs adequately. Participation in the decision-making process can take a variety of forms. The indications of the research are that making decisions by majority vote may be one of the less satisfactory methods. School staffs studied found majority vote competitive and frustrating and seemed to favor the principal's soliciting opinion and insights from all concerned, while retaining final decisional authority. Another strategy associated with this behavior involves solicitation of input from each person affected as to what kinds of decisions s/he wants to contribute to, what kinds s/he wants to be informed about after they are made, and what kinds s/he is not concerned about at all. Along with that, information is given about what kinds of decisions the leader will make unilaterally and for what reasons. Balderson (1975) found that where teachers perceive that a principal uses the power of expertise (rather than personal qualities, ability to bestow benefits or punishments, or status) their morale is high. Conversely, those principals whom teachers saw as experts tended to favor their teachers experimenting with new ideas and techniques, doing an effective job of instruction, and suggesting ideas for school improvement.

The effective leader demonstrates consideration for those with whom s/he works. Cunningham (1976) stresses the ability to respect those who differ and to credit differences fairly, keep them in perspective, and use them constructively. Also involved is the ability to recognize that people change at different rates, have different needs, interests, and expectations. This would seem to be doubly important where issues of desegregation, multi-cultural education, mainstreaming and the like are concerned. Huge (1977) emphasizes that the effective school climate leader knows the staff well and builds on strengths rather than weaknesses. Valentine and Tate (1975) found that where a leader uses "indirect verbal behavior"--expresses and accepts expressions of feelings, opinions and values and uses humor--teachers, students and parents tend to perceive the school atmosphere as a caring organization, conducive to self-development. Interestingly, they did not perceive that behavior as conducive to achievement unless the person also engaged in considerable "direct verbal behavior"--giving directions, emphasizing main points, stating decisions and criticism.

Effective leaders communicate openly and encourage others to do so; indeed, they initiate processes and procedures which insure that communication is carried throughout the organization. This presupposes that they feel sufficiently comfortable and competent not to be threatened by criticism and can see occasional conflicts of viewpoint as opportunities for individual and organizational renewal. The effective leader continually communicates the goals of the school and, so to speak, keeps restating the vision of all teachers teaching well and all students learning well. S/he frequently visits classrooms, is often seen interacting with staff and students outside his or her office--in halls, cafeteria, playground, etc. As noted in the preceding paragraph, the content of the leader's verbal behavior has been shown to have considerable impact on whether or not students see school as a place of achievement or satisfaction, or both. Communication is always a two-way process, and the effective leader builds into the communication process procedures by which s/he receives feedback about his/her own behavior and the effect it has on those with whom s/he works. There are a variety of ways to be a "good listener" (an indicator which appears often in research about leaders), and setting up relatively low risk feedback mechanisms is one of them.

The establishing and maintaining of well-defined structures is another characteristic of the effective leader. A survey of theory and research concerning leadership by Stogdill, quoted by Miller (1976) found that students tend to score higher on tests of school achievement when teachers and principals are described as high in structure and in consideration. While the leader may need to live with ambiguity, s/he diminishes it for others by setting up clear procedures and practices that help people get things done with a minimum of confusion. Another expression of this is a teacher appraisal procedure in which staff knows that no evaluation will be used as dismissal evidence unless and until the principal explains what specific changes must be made by what specific time.

The leader uses a logical, clear problem-solving process that is understandable to others. S/he seeks information rather than hearsay, knows how to look for alternative solutions and how to evaluate results systematically. S/he does not try to solve all problems singlehandedly. S/he can delegate responsibility and uses time well. Sexton and Switzer (1978) state blankly that the effective leader makes no phone calls longer than five minutes.

One of the characteristics mentioned most often in the research about effective educational leaders is that they have high expectations for themselves and others and they communicate those expectations positively. Washington (1980) says that the principal conveys attitudes and feelings that translate into, "The standards are high here," "We expect teachers to teach and children to learn," "We are creative and responsible." Those kinds of statements are one way of fostering commitment of the school's professional staff to teaching all pupils in the building. Kelley (1980) emphasizes that leadership, whether in a school district, building, or classroom, "means setting high expectations for self and others, designing plans to allow self and others to reach those expectations, and recognizing those conditions which help or hinder that achievement." One cannot have either a sense of complacency or a sense of futility and still provide leadership in a significant way. The

22

importance of the principal having expectations of the faculty for collegial and analytic/experimental work has already been emphasized. Extensive research has occurred in the last decade on the effects of teacher expectations on student achievement. It is not clear that expectations cause achievement but it is clear that there is a correlation, and it is also clear that different expectations may cause a teacher to behave differently to different students which may, in turn, result in different responses from students.

SCHOOL CLIMATE--WHAT IT IS AND HOW WE RECOGNIZE DESIRABLE SCHOOL CLIMATE

School climate is a vague concept which has been defined in various ways, and perhaps more often described than defined. In a Handbook produced in 1977 by the Massachusetts Department of Education, it is defined as the feelings and opinions about various aspects of a school with respect to thirteen variables in the three domains of personal relationship, personal development, and effective organization. Eugene Howard (1980) says that school climate is the "aggregate of social and cultural conditions which influence individual behavior in the school--all of the forces to which the individual responds which are present in the school environment." Howard also defines it as the qualities of the school and the people in the school which affect how people feel while they are there. Freiburg and Buckley (1981) comment that "the climate of a school may be compared to the air we breathe--we ignore it until it becomes noticeably offensive."

Zigarmi (1981) defines climate as measurable properties of an environment which (1) distinguish the organization from other organizations, (2) are relatively enduring over time, (3) are experienced by most organizational members, and (4) influence organizational members' attitudes toward certain organizational outcomes and strategies for achieving those outcomes. He characterizes a healthy climate as one in which problem-solving is facilitated by the members' sense of common purpose, personal satisfaction, and mutual trust.

Much thought about school climate owes its origins to the work of Henry Murray, who first advanced the idea that every environment is characterized by directional tendencies--"press"--either in a way that facilitates or impedes individual effort to meet needs for achievement, affiliation, autonomy, order, and so on. Kelley (1980) defines school climate as the prevailing or normative conditions, practices and events (formed by the norms, beliefs, and attitudes of those in the school environment) which affect the attainment of satisfaction and accomplishment. He distinguishes "good" from "bad" climate in terms of how well its outcomes meet the expectations of those in it. Some social environments (of which schools are one) are expected to produce satisfaction, some are expected to produce task accomplishment, and some are expected to be both satisfying and productive. Early research about school climate tended to focus on satisfaction and to assume that satisfaction led to productivity. More recent research, perhaps reflecting the public clamor for "back to basics," seems to focus on productivity and to assume that productivity leads to satisfaction. Research seems to bear out that increased satisfaction is not necessarily accompanied by increased productivity. Additionally, what increases either productivity or satisfaction for some people in an environment may, in fact, decrease the level for others. Environment changes are situation-specific, and what works at one time in one situation may not work in another.

In any event, what is "good" school climate obviously depends on what outcomes one wants to attain. The outcomes this report addresses are those defined as desirable by the members of the Research and Development Utilization group within the Urban Education Network. They want a school climate that produces satisfactory human relationships (persons involved communicate with each other and make decisions in ways that convey respect and consideration, regardless of race, sex, economic status, individual differences) and productivity (students do well academically, especially on basic skills; teachers convey curriculum effectively; principals and other administrators take the lead in maintaining positive expectations for teaching/learning and providing resources that help to translate those expectations into performance.)

Given the preceding desired outcomes, the following list is a composite of indicators of good school climate suggested by pertinent research (Edmonds, Clark, Huge, Brookover, Beckum, Dasho, Morgan, Moos, Coles, Chalupsky, David and Roger Johnson, Little and others).

1. Clear expectations by teachers that all students can be taught and none will fall below minimum levels of achievement
2. Expectations by students that they can learn, and a perception by students that their efforts control their achievement
3. Tendency on the part of staff to treat students equivalently rather than dividing them by ability
4. Adherence to mastery learning concepts
5. Acquisition of basic skills takes precedence over other school activities
6. Tendency to use cooperative team learning techniques to promote peer instruction, motivation, and integration
7. Frequent monitoring of pupil progress in relationship to instructional objectives--greater reliance on achievement test data as prescriptive
8. Orderly, relatively quiet, well-structured milieu conducive to maximum academic engaged time
9. Strong leadership from administration; involvement of principal in the instructional program
10. Staff norms for collegial work and continuous improvement
11. Recognition for achievement and positive behavior
12. Parent involvement and reinforcement of expectations for student achievement

A few comments might be added for explanation and emphasis. One is repetitive of what has been said in the section on effective leadership but bears repeating here. That is that, whether s/he wishes it or not, the principal is the school climate leader in most schools. Those within the school environment tend to see their satisfaction and productivity as direct or indirect outcomes of what the principal does or could do. Those outside the school hold the principal accountable for what occurs within it. Even those principals who are quick to bemoan their limitations by upper level school administration on the one hand and well-organized teachers' unions on the other (and community pressure somewhere in between) must recognize that they are at the same time in a unique position to influence all these participants in the schooling process. Kelley (1980) states the case strongly: "In all but a few instances, the principal exercises leadership with regard to school climate or the school environment is in chaos due to a lack of leadership...the principal who has had a tenure of three years or more in a building is likely to be held accountable for 60% or more of what is or is not occurring. The patterns which exist are those which the principal has initiated or has, instead, permitted to exist."

The expectations for student achievement from both principal and teachers must be associated with a student's ability (and perception of that ability) to affect his/her achievement by his/her own effort. Some of the research on the effects of teacher expectations on student achievement has clearly shown that some teachers interact differently with students who have poor achievement records than they do with high achievers. One of the differences is that teacher feedback to low achievers sometimes gives the message that effort and achievement are not related. When that is the case, it is hardly surprising that students retreat into despair and apathy.

Another comment might clarify the assertion that the tendency to use cooperative team learning techniques promotes integration. Beckum and Dasho (1980) found that successful multi-cultural environments require structured academic interaction of different ethnic groups. Just placing students from different ethnic groups in a classroom together does not integration make, because they tend to remain in the same social groups they brought to the classroom unless they are required to interact for academic reasons. Damico, et al (1980) found that middle school students tended to segregate by ability more than race unless team learning techniques are used. Rutter, et al (1979) consistently found that a joint working together over time for the same purpose is a most effective means of reducing inter-group conflict. Slavin and Oickle (1980) report that the typical efforts to improve race relations in schools--human relations training for teachers, minority studies programs for students, student advisory committees to attempt to decrease racial tensions, and so on--serve some purpose but tend to leave interracial contact between students largely superficial, competitive, and often unequal. Conversely, students of different races who have worked together in academic teams or on athletic teams were much more likely to have interracial friendships and positive racial attitudes than students who had not had such cooperative experiences. By contrast, reports of having discussed race relations in class made few consistent differences in behavior or attitudes. Research studying the effects of team learning strategies developed at The Johns Hopkins University supports the effectiveness of these methods for improving student achievement (and for narrowing the gap between achievement of whites and minority students), for increasing student self-esteem, liking of school, peer support for academic performance, and mutual concern.

Miller (1981) emphasizes an additional reason for using team learning strategies. In a school climate improvement intervention effort by Brookover and associates, use of the academic teams provided an "early and visible success" for teachers and thereby increased the likelihood that staff would develop new norms and adopt practices consistent with school climate improvement goals. Miller states that "team games have been a major factor in which the adult staff has structured interaction to improve student norms and attitudes toward learning."

It might be emphasized also that considerable research indicates that cooperative goal structures are more productive than either competitive or individualistic ones, yet practice has continued to stress competition or (in the last decade) individual effort. In this context, cooperative structures mean that students achieve their goals only if other students do also; competitive structures mean that students achieve goals only if other students do not; and individualistic structures mean that one student's achievement is unrelated to that of others. The work of Johnson and Johnson (1980) suggests that competition can be productive only when it does not matter whether one wins or loses and when everyone involved has a reasonable chance to win and can monitor the progress of competitors in relation to oneself. Those circumstances seldom exist in the classroom. A meta-analysis of studies comparing the relative effects on achievement and productivity of cooperation, competition and individualistic efforts consistently shows that the average student studying cooperatively performs at about the 80th percentile of students working competitively or individualistically. Even though the research is clear about the strong correlation of cooperative learning to desirable instructional outcomes, student-student interaction has not been emphasized in preparing teachers and administrators or in the development of curriculum.

Aside from the use of cooperative teams, so-called "innovative teaching methods" have not been shown to result in increased student achievement as compared to "traditional" methods. They may, however, result in higher student satisfaction. Coles and Chalupsky (in Walberg, 1979) studied the effects of individualizing instruction as an innovation and found that it is probably helpful in taking into account students' needs and learning styles, but is detrimental if it permits students too much independence in deciding what to study, what period of time to study, and what level of achievement to attempt. Only highly motivated students seemed able to make and follow through on those kinds of decisions.

A study from Mesa, Arizona, reminds us that, regardless of how many indicators of a desirable school climate may seem to be present, students' *perceptions* of climate tend to become increasingly negative as they progress from sixth grade through senior high. The most notable change in attitude from favorable to unfavorable occurs between sixth grade and seventh to ninth grade, with the maximum degree of negativity at tenth grade. After that it becomes more favorable. Interestingly, parents and teachers exhibit corresponding (but not as great) increases in negative perceptions at the same times students do.

SCHOOL CLIMATE IMPROVEMENT

PROCESSES FOR IMPROVING SCHOOL CLIMATE

The processes for implementing a program of school climate improvement vary more in the degree of detail with which they are described than they do in approach.

The Massachusetts Department of Education, in their School Climate Handbook 1976-77, recommends a nine-step procedure that is typical:

1. take initiative
2. form a representative school climate team
3. develop a team work plan
4. select study purposes
5. administer and score questionnaires
6. analyze and interpret results
7. develop a school improvement plan
8. implement plan
9. evaluate impact on school climate

The Massachusetts Handbook, intended as a guide for use in Massachusetts high schools, devotes considerable attention to the mechanics of administering, scoring and analyzing the school climate questionnaire to be used for collection of baseline data, and somewhat less detail to ideas for improvement of climate. The recommendation is made that a school not initiate the process described unless a school climate team can devote at least two hours per week for two school years to the work, and unless there is at least a minimum budget for materials and data processing. During the first year the team studies the school climate and develops an improvement plan; during the second year the plan is implemented and evaluated.

In elaborating on the nine steps of the process, the Handbook cautions that whoever considers initiating a school climate study must examine his/her reasons for wanting to do it, since others in the school environment are sure to question the motivation. In order to deal with the possible resistance to participation in a climate study, the initiator should be sure that his/her own reasons for wanting to do it do not include a wish to discredit anybody in the school. The potential advantages and disadvantages of studying a school's climate should be discussed with members of representative groups within the school. If broad support does not exist for such an effort, it is likely to do more harm than good.

Another recommendation in the Massachusetts Handbook is that members of the school climate team (probably eight to twelve persons) should be given some incentives for their investment of time and energy. Students might receive credit equivalent to that which they would earn in an elective course; teachers might receive inservice credit; their work should be included on their experience records.

It is also suggested that the team construct a timetable by deciding where they want to be by the close of the school year and working backwards to determine who must do what by what date. Another point that is stressed is that the team's meetings should always be open to all members of the school community and that there must be continuing interaction between team and the larger school community if cooperation is to be expected.

One of the most frequently encountered processes for school climate improvement is that advocated by Eugene Howard from the Colorado Department of Education. Howard is director of School Improvement and Leadership for that department and directs several state programs for improving school climate. He has been an associate of CFK, Ltd., (funded by Charles F. Kettering Foundation) through which some early efforts were made to translate organizational climate improvement processes from business to education. The movement begun by CFK, Ltd. eventually became associated with CADRE (the Collegial Association for the Development and Renewal of Educators). Howard is also the author of the leader's guide for ASCD's recently published Improving School Climate: A Staff Development-School Improvement Process. Whether you find an eight-step process or a thirteen-step process depends upon which version of Howard's work you read. The eight-step version includes:

1. form school climate improvement committee
2. collect baseline data such as achievement, attendance, vandalism, disciplinary actions
3. raise level of faculty, student and parent awareness about what would be accomplished by school climate improvement activities
4. assess school climate through a mini-audit
5. brainstorm and prioritize what to concentrate on
6. form one to five task forces to work on specific programs
7. manage task forces and do formative evaluation
8. do summative evaluations using same methods and instruments used to collect baseline data

The longer version, contained in the ASCD materials, repeats steps three through seven (which become steps eight through twelve) before conducting a summative evaluation. Like the Massachusetts Handbook process, the ASCD materials suggest that it is likely to take two school years to reach the program's objectives. The principal is expected to be the initiator in forming the School Climate Improvement Committee; members of the committee also serve as task force leaders when the task forces are formed.

The ASCD process looks at general determinants of school climate as well as program, process, and material determinants. These are assessed in terms of what is and what should be by using the so-called "mini-audits." Mini-audit #1 assesses program determinants (active learning, individualized performance expectations/varied reward systems, varied learning environments, flexible curriculum, extracurricular activities, appropriate support and structure, and cooperatively determined rules). The information collected from this mini-audit is intended to identify activities, programs, and practices which have been most often reported as helpful in improving school climate. Mini-audit #2 assesses process determinants (problem solving, decision making, working with conflicts, improvement of school goals and planning, effective communications, autonomy with accountability, effective teaching/learning strategies) and materials determinants (adequate resources, supportive logistical systems, and suitability of school plant and grounds). Both audits, unlike some assessment instruments, seem to accentuate the positive/build on strengths concept.

With the ASCD process, the mini-audits are completed by faculty and selected others, perhaps in groups of three where each individual completes the form but discussion and information sharing about the items is encouraged during the completion process. In some of his other writing on the subject, Howard recommends that there be only one mini-audit and that it be conducted by a team of visitors to the school. These visitors are people who are familiar with the Cfk, Ltd./CADRE approach, who then observe school activities and interview selected persons in the school environment, identifying the climate determinants and outcomes. Howard recommends that the team, which is usually two to six people depending on the size of the school, include at least one teacher, and that other members be administrators, university staff members, counselors, or other professionals acquainted with school climate. When this approach to the mini-audit is used, the visiting team completes observations and interviews during the morning and early afternoon, meets to chart their findings under the various categories of program, process, and material determinants, and then meets with the faculty to report on their findings and get feedback, including additions and corrections. At a later time the staff decides how they want to translate the information from the audit into action plans for climate improvement.

Freiburg and Buckley (1981), in reporting on a school climate improvement project conducted jointly by the University of Houston College of Education and the Houston Independent School District Teacher Corps Program, discuss a change model which they used "as a frame of reference rather than a plan for implementation." The change model includes ten variables affecting change and gives specific indicators of each variable. For instance, under the first variable, definition of goals, three indicators are given: (a) describe in writing the ideal situation given maximum change, (b) describe the situation which exists at present, and (c) measure the dissonance between indicators (a) and (b). Other variables are:

(2) size of the unit to be changed (indicated by numbers of administrators, faculty, students, and compactness of system in terms of physical distance between people and sites)

(3) degree of entrenchment of unit to be changed (indicated by such items as number of new or experimental programs already operating in the system, general support for new ideas, time during which a non-change mentality has prevailed)

(4) key people and basic support groups (indicated by identification of budget decision-makers, people and organizations likely to favor or oppose change efforts)

(5) credibility of change agent (indicated by such things as number of times the change agent is asked for help or works with older staff at their request, quantity of change agent's social interactions, and so on)--Freiburg and Buckley say that this variable seems to have most impact on success or failure of lasting change.

(6) patience and sensitivity to basic needs of people on the part of the change agent (indicated by identification of amount of threat to people's needs for security, relationship, etc.)

(7) "knowledge of judo"--using the institution "against itself" to create change (indicated by the way the change agent follows rules, treats cultural symbols)

(8) resistance phenomenon (indicated by response to memos, suggestions)

(9) change readiness (may be related to number of attempts for change; indicated by verbal rhetoric concerning change, percentage of people who agree with change agent's stated position)

(10) lasting change is a slow process--amount of time allowed for change to occur (indicated by such factors as availability of two to three years for implementation of change; change agent's willingness for change to occur without his/her getting credit, since the change may outlast the agent).

Obviously, some of the ten variables can be instituted only by a school's professional staff, while others can be facilitated by an "outside" catalyst. Frieburg and Buckley conclude that the change model indicates that the key to maintaining and improving school climate is the involvement of teachers, administrators, and support personnel in leadership roles in the planning and implementation process.

Perhaps the most detailed and comprehensive process for school climate improvement is presented by Edgar Kelley in his monograph, Climate Development for Schools: Principles and Practices, published by the National Association of Secondary School Principals. His is a twenty-two step plan:

1. define climate
2. validate climate definition
3. identify audiences

4. assess climate concerns
5. select targets for climate review
6. plan review process
7. diagnose existing climate conditions and outcomes
8. identify desired changes
9. review findings
10. select target projects for climate improvement
11. identify audiences for each project
12. identify related environments for each target project
13. identify resource needs
14. specify desired outcomes
15. select strategies to be used
16. establish timelines for each target project
17. review expected and possible outcomes
18. develop communication plans
19. develop evaluation plans
20. review feasibility of plans made
21. revise, affirm, and implement target plans
22. monitor implementation processes for formative evaluation

Kelley discusses each of the twenty-two steps, making recommendations and pointing out possible pitfalls. His emphasis on review at various stages of the process would seem to help insure that focus is kept on desired outcomes and that projects be chosen on their own merit and not because they are someone's pet idea. He advocates using the "Rule of 3's" at several points in the process to avoid the confusion of too many options. No more than three major concerns are to be dealt with and it should be expected that project activities are likely to go through three cycles, a cycle usually meaning a school year. Not until the third cycle are new practices likely to be institutionalized.

Regardless of which process one uses, it would seem to be wise to follow several of Kelley's cautions: one should consider early in the process whether one's efforts at change are likely to have noticeable effects. If the level of satisfaction with a school environment is more than 80%, little change is likely to be effected; if 60-80%, change efforts can be productive; and if less than 60%, improvement efforts would appear to be high priority. He also emphasizes a point made by the Massachusetts Handbook: better not to create expectations which one does not have the resources to fulfill--look realistically at the availability of money, material, and personnel before making a commitment to an improvement effort. Finally, expressing the objectives of an improvement effort in terms of changes in products that are expected as a result of process changes avoids difficulties in evaluation.

The experience of the Brookover research team in attempting to implement a school climate improvement effort in a medium-sized Michigan city school system is also instructive. After their research had identified aspects of school organization that stood out in spontaneously occurring high-achieving schools, the researchers were asked to try, through an intervention and consultation effort, to transform a group of four low-achieving urban schools into higher-achieving schools with positive academic climates and expectations about students. (Because time constraints forced them to develop their operational plan very quickly, it is not intended to be taken as a "model" in the sense of those previously described.) As reported by Tornatzsky et al (1980), their attempts to translate descriptive data into a set of concrete prescriptions for teachers and administrators resulted in a three-fold plan:

(1) each identified feature of positive school climate was incorporated into an instructional modular format that described basic concepts and assigned teachers specific "homework" to perform in their classrooms;

35

(2) each of the modules was to be presented, in sequence, to school staffs via lecture and consultation, with the assumption that teachers would make changes in classroom practice based on the information presented;

(3) an on-site consultant-facilitator would be on duty in the school two or three days a week to reinforce the formal presentation and help school staff implement recommended practices.

The effort encountered a number of obstacles and led to some tentative conclusions on conditions necessary for the process of school climate change to occur. These conclusions, reported by Stephen K. Miller (1981), are: (1) staff must make a voluntary commitment to participate in the change effort (as opposed to "being volunteered" by the principal or some other administrator); (2) there must be strong instructional leadership in the building, either from the principal or some other person; and (3) implementation practices of the staff must result in at least some quick and visible success (in this particular implementation, this factor appeared to be most often provided by the use of academic team learning games which improved motivation of both students and teachers and helped to change teacher attitudes about student ability to achieve).

Another conclusion reached by the Brookover group is that, before any large-scale intervention is undertaken, a necessary first step is the survey of policies and practices of the central administration prior to program implementation at the level of the local school building. Their analysis, reported by Hathaway (1981), of district policy manuals, the master agreement between the district and the teachers' association, and interviews with several central administration personnel regarding the goals of education in the district revealed considerable divergence in the perception of goals and objectives by administration personnel, as well as lack of specificity and clarity in the policy manuals. They were able to trace some of the resistance to change which they encountered at the school building level to this lack of goal clarity. One of their instructional modules for teachers recommended that they state clearly their expectations for students, and Hathaway concludes that "the same admonishment should be directed to the entire district, from the Board of Education all the way through and including the individual building personnel."

Instruments for Assessing School Climate

In choosing an assessment instrument, one initial decision to be made is whether one wants to measure satisfaction (morale), productivity, or both.

Another factor to be considered is whether or not you want high-inference or low-inference responses. Kuert (in Walberg, 1979) points out that observational techniques (which answer the question, "how many?") tend to be low inference, whereas self-report techniques (which answer the question, "what does this mean?") tend to be high-inference. The low-inference instruments are more prevalent, but substantially less valid in predicting learning outcomes.

A serious problem with most existing instruments intended to measure attitudes is that they are unidimensional. Techniques like Likert, Guttman, and Thurstone scales give a single evaluative continuum that measures the attitude as a generalized pro-con, favorable-unfavorable, positive-negative, like-dislike continuum. Since an attitude is multidimensional and situation specific, a general measure is at best a gross approximation of a person's actual feelings. Use of such instruments may be one reason that research about attitudes often produces contradictory findings. James McMillan (1980), points out that an instrument for assessing attitudes needs to be multidimensional to reflect that attitudes have affective, cognitive and behavioral components and that the context of the question is important. He gives an example of a student who could report that math is valuable and enjoyable in Mr. Jones's class, but useless and boring in Mrs. Brown's class. McMillan also mentions a study by Kahn which used pictorial stimuli and self-ratings of eight-year olds with teacher-rating of pupils to measure attitudes toward school, teacher, self, and independence as an example of using the strengths and also of balancing the weaknesses of self-report (acquiescence, social desirability, faking) and ratings by others (selective perception, forgetting, halo effect) to get a multidimensional assessment. He believes that such an approach is much more likely to provide specific information that can help educators to see how to develop positive attitudes.

Kelley (1980) suggests that already collected data may be of more use in assessing school climate than formal assessments with other instruments. Information about student attendance, achievement as measured by grades and test scores, and disciplinary referrals is usually available for interpretation. In order to use such data effectively, decisions must be made about which data to compare and what types of comparison should be made, as well as how data should be organized to show trends.

Following are descriptions of some of the available instruments for school climate assessment.

Barclay Classroom Climate Inventory

A multiple measurement device for assessing individual differences and the characteristics of the classroom climate. Measures social interaction and expectation variables for elementary school children. There are forty-two short scales which measure (1) self-competency skills, (2) peer judgments, (3) vocational awareness, (4) behavioral reinforcers, and (5) teacher expectations. Results are scored and integrated by computer which prints out an individual report on each child, a group report for the total class, and some summary tables relating to overall characteristics of children and suspected problem areas. Specimen set available for $10.50 from Educational Skills Development, Inc., 179 East Maxwell St., Lexington, KY 40508.

CFK, Ltd. School District Climate Profile

This instrument attempts to synthesize a research approach (description, analysis) with a pragmatic, action-oriented, experience-based approach. More general than the OCDQ; tends to define climate as morale. Four components are included: (1) general climate: respect, caring, trust, morale, input, academic and social growth, cohesiveness, school renewal, (2) program determinants (active learning opportunities, individualization, varied environments, flexibility, structures appropriate to maturity, rules, varied reward systems), (3) process determinants (effective communication, shared decision-making, problem solving, goals, autonomy with accountability, teaching strategies, planning) and (4) material determinants (adequate resources, supportive and efficient logistical system, school plant). This instrument has been criticized on several counts: the categories tested have not been shown by research to be valid representations of climate; levels of reliability, validity, and concurrent or predictive validity with other measures have not been established; it is based on assumptions that satisfaction increases productivity and that "open climates" are better than "closed" ones, neither of which are supported by research. The Profile, with instructions for use, is published by Phi Delta Kappa in the pamphlet, School Climate Improvement: A Challenge to the School Administrator by Robert Fox, et al. (Purchase of the ASCD materials allows reproduction of the CFK, Ltd. School Climate Profile instrument for use with the school faculty).

Checklist for Diagnosing the School Climate

Includes four sections: curriculum and instructional program, school environment, school and community, staff. Focuses on whether or not school has a multi-cultural orientation. Produced by the Community Relations Service, U.S. Department of Justice; included in the booklet, "Human Relations: A Guide for Leadership Training in the Public Schools" (summary report of the Syracuse project).

Classroom Environment Scale (CES)

By Rudolph Moos and Edison Trickett, for grades seven through twelve. Norm-referenced. The Real Form (Form R) measures relationship dimensions (involvement, affiliation, teacher support), personal development dimensions (task orientation, competition), system maintenance dimensions (order and organization, rule clarity, teacher control) and system change dimensions (innovation). There are two parallel forms: The Ideal Form (Form I) asks people how they conceive of an ideal classroom environment. The Expectations Form (Form E) asks prospective members of a class what they think the social milieu they are about to enter is like. This instrument is compatible with school climate defined as both productivity and satisfaction. Available from Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc., 577 College Avenue, Palo Alto, CA 94306.

High School Environment Index (HSCI), Classroom Environment Index (CEI), Elementary and Secondary School Index (ESI)

These are some of the so-called "Syracuse Indexes." They measure perception of climate held by students; yield information about seven first-order factors and three second-order factors. The ESI is a short form of the HSCI or CEI, with sixty-one items. First-order factors are intellectual climate, expressiveness, group social life, personal dignity, achievement standards, control, and peer group dominance. Second-order factors are development press, control and peer group dominance. Available from Center for Instructional Development, Test Scoring and Evaluation Services, 250 Machinery Hall, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York 13210.

How Effective Are Your Schools?

A checklist for citizens developed by the Council for Basic Education. Questionnaire has sections on (1) leadership by principal and senior staff, (2) emphasis on academic achievement in basic subjects, (3) assessment of student progress and academic programs, (4) teachers' values and expectations, (5) climate of orderliness, (6) support from parents and other citizens. Questions highlight factors important to learning. Available from Council for Basic Education, 725 Fifteenth St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005.

Learning Environment Inventory (LEI)

Most widely used instrument for measuring student perception of school environment. For grades seven and above. Each of the fifteen scales consists of seven items describing characteristics of classes using a four-point Likert scale. "High-Inference" measures that require subjective ratings of perceived behavior. Measures characteristics such as cohesiveness, formality, diversity, speed, environment, friction, goal direction, favoritism, difficulty, democracy, apathy, satisfaction, cliquishness, competitiveness, and disorganization.

My School (MS) or My Class (MC)

An adaptation of LEI for elementary students. Forty-five items, five subscales. Yields scores for satisfaction, friction, competitiveness, difficulty, and cohesiveness.

Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ)

By Halpin and Croft. Designed to measure faculty perceptions of school climate. Sixty-four items, eight subtests (four on faculty as a group and four on characteristics of principal as a leader). The developers used findings to classify school climates as "open" or "closed." Primarily a morale instrument designed for use in elementary school and criticized by some as not suitable to large, urban or secondary schools. Group behavior subtests intended to measure "disengagement" (teachers' tendency toward anomie), hindrance (teachers' perception of whether the principal facilitates or hinders their work), esprit (teacher morale) and intimacy (social needs satisfaction). The leader behavior subtests were intended to measure aloofness (is the principal impersonal and formal or emotionally involved with his staff), production emphasis (is the principal highly directive and not sensitive to staff feedback), thrust (does the principal motivate teachers by setting a good example and personally moving the organization) and consideration (does the principal treat teachers "humanly").

Organizational Climate Index (OCI)

One of the so-called "Syracuse Indexes," designed to measure faculty and staff perceptions. Original form has been refined into a "short form" of eighty items which measure six first-order factors (intellectual climate, achievement standards, personal dignity, organizational effectiveness, orderliness, and impulse control). Factor analysis and combination yield two second-order factors: development press and task effectiveness, so that the instrument is useful with climate definitions that include both satisfaction and productivity. Reliability and validity levels are available. Criticized as being difficult to use for needs assessment and expensive because data must be sent to Syracuse University for scoring and interpretation. Sample sets of instruments and answer sheets available from Center for Instructional Development, Test Scoring and Evaluation Services, 250 Machinery Hall, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York, 13210.

Organizational Health Instrument

A diagnostic tool designed to measure organizational effectiveness. The eighty item instrument yields an organizational health profile for each of the following ten dimensions: Goal Focus, Communication Adequacy, Power Equalization, Resource Utilization, Cohesiveness, Morale, Innovativeness, Autonomy, Adaptation, and Problem-solving Adequacy. Forms are available for teachers, parents, and administrators. Available from Organizational Health: Diagnosis and Development Corporation, P.O. Box 1525, Fayetteville, AR 72701.

Quality of School Life (QSL)

By Joyce Epstein and James McPartland. Twenty-seven items that measure student satisfaction, commitment to classwork, and reactions to teachers. For use with grades four through twelve (or may be read aloud to lower grades). Available from Center for Social Organization of Schools, The Johns Hopkins University, 3505 N. Charles St., Baltimore, MD 21218.

Teacher Corps Program Evaluation

A Physical Environment Observation instrument that checks at various times and places in the school day for factors such as positive or negative social climate, amount of litter and graffiti, adult supervision, movement of students, integration, and so on.

Leadership Training

Saario, in Herriott and Gross (1979), recommends that leadership training for educators should place less stress on acquisition of skills defined by time or circumstance, and more on a set of talents which define the consummate leader in any circumstance. He cites an analytic model by James March which is intended for management in business and therefore omits an emphasis on pedagogical leadership but is otherwise applicable. That model indicates that a manager needs these talents:

1. analysis of expertise: managing the relation between expert and non-expert
2. analysis of coalitions: managing of conflict, building coalitions
3. analysis of ambiguity: managing goals; acting intelligently in ambiguous situations
4. analysis of time: management of attention
5. analysis of information; managing inference from available data.

Novotney and Tye (1973) analyze leaders' needs this way:

1. efficiency: methodology for problem-solving
2. effectiveness: human relation skills that facilitate group action and success
3. self-understanding: knowledge of one's basic assumptions about others, knowledge about one's strengths and weaknesses and impact on others
4. perspective: how to reach goals; how to analyze issues, trends, research.

Recent studies by Peterson (1980) and Pitner (1980) emphasize the varied, disconnected nature of the principal's work and suggest that training for effective "principaling" is training for making sense of a fragmented, stressful job, for doing work between interruptions, for thinking and speaking on one's feet, for interacting with people of different ages, educational experience, language patterns, roles, and so on. Howell (1981) says that continuing education for principals should include ways to improve time use, tactics for delegation...with "liberal sprinkles" of stress management, communication techniques, and other coping skills." Critics of this approach question whether the fact that many principals seem to spend their days in a helter-skelter of activity and spontaneous decision-making means that that is what they should be trained to do. These critics, who tend to stress the managerial aspects of the principalship, suggest that the nature of the job might be made less piecemeal by the establishment of clear priorities.

Zigarmi (1981) stresses the need for school administrator training to be related to data on school climate regardless of whether or not the overt aim of the training is the improvement of school climate. He believes that the principal must have accurate data about the climate of his/her school because of (1) the strong relationship between organizational climate and staff job satisfaction, (2) the greater effectiveness of problem-solving and conflict resolution efforts in an atmosphere where differences are openly confronted and discussed and (3) the increased acceptance of innovation in a climate where morale is high and support is available. He also asserts that administrative training needs to be problem-centered, site-specific, and must involve some (anonymous and confidential) on-site data collection.

There seems little disagreement that leaders need skills in communication, decision-making, conflict resolution, and management of change. What is less apparent is how these skills are best attained. In the beginning pages of this report it was noted that far more principals are currently in service in schools than are in training to become principals. That means that inservice education for leadership takes on even greater importance. LaPlant, in a review of inservice education for principals, concluded that it is "usually topic-specific, oriented toward quick solutions, and based upon a diffusion model which assumes that awareness will lead individuals to apply these new understandings in the context of practice."

Discussants at a session on the principalship at the 1981 AERA meeting commented on the "quick solution" kind of training, stressing that it is of little use unless the principal can be part of an ongoing support group after such short, isolated workshops. They seemed to agree also, that, despite the possible vulnerability involved, most administrators prefer being trained by other administrators.

Wayson, in Erickson and Reller (1979) recommends a three-step process for helping teachers and principals examine their roles to overcome the barriers to leadership. He believes that those barriers are largely internal ones which can be dissolved by (1) defining the stereotype of the role, (2) differentiating expectations--estimating the percentage of students, parents, superintendents, etc. who make demands for certain behaviors, and (3) owning the role--seeing that neither the expectations nor the people who have them are beyond influence by the principal or teacher.

Wayson further asserts that educational leaders should be guided by four precepts that will help them see many ways to make the relatively small adjustments in school practice that are required in order for one to be seen as a leader. Those four precepts are (1) look at standardized practices to see if there are other, more educational options, (2) look at the school as a community rather than an institution and use the forces of community to achieve educational purposes, (3) continuously ask yourself and others why things are done the way they are, and (4) always consult original sources about decisions that limit you to find out if those decisions can be changed.

Although it was written about inservice for teachers, the information by David W. and Roger T. Johnson in The Developer, 1980, seems to have application to inservice for administrators as well. They state, "While the specific objectives of each inservice vary, there are a set of general objectives that most inservice programs try to achieve. These objectives not only include mastering new strategies and procedures, they involve attitude changes and sustaining new behavioral patterns for weeks, months, and years after the inservice has ended. Conducting a successful inservice borders on being about as easy as running a successful weight loss clinic." Based on their considerable research, the most effective inservice "requires the use of cooperative learning groups during the inservice sessions followed by the use of collaborative support groups to assist and maintain the implementation of the innovation being presented." The Johnsons' research leads them to assert that most inservice programs "consist of up to 90% lecture; concentrate on entertaining teachers with jokes, stories, and media presentations; and use the word 'individualize' every minute or two: all strategies that are based on false assumptions about what motivates people to try out and continue to use new practices and procedures."

The relatively unhappy state of inservice affairs has been confirmed repeatedly. Relic and Griffin (1979) report that the Education Division of HEW, in 1978, gathered data informally and through a survey of superintendents which revealed widespread dissatisfaction with existing administrator training. The data revealed "pervasive concern with respect to the quality of training by all existing sources, unhealthy competition among existing training sources--including colleges of education, state agencies, and professional organizations--resulting in fragmented and inefficient services, and a host of good practices but limited mechanisms or opportunities for sharing them." One conclusion drawn from the data is that there is a strong need for more networking for the exchange of models, programs, and ideas and better cooperation between colleges of education, state departments of education, local school districts, and professional associations.

The Urban High School Reform Initiative Final Report (1979), agreed that reform of inservice is needed, and made recommendations concerning the improvement of skills of high school principals. Among their recommendations were: reward principals who engage in improvement efforts (pay for advanced training, provide funds for special consulting, grant multi-year guarantees and/or special discretionary awards), provide access to internships and to executive pairing and management programs that familiarize principals with the latest management practices in the private sector; provide systematic evaluation and feedback of principal performance; arrange for a school site council or similar body to assume much of the public relations and school-community work so that the principal has more in-school time; and expand the executive academy concept at district, regional, state, and federal levels.

A description of a number of programs for leadership training (primarily for principals) currently in use will now be described.

The executive academy concept is being carried out in several states. The Pennsylvania State Department of Education began an executive academy program in 1973 and now provides thirty-five to forty seminars each year. These seminars, usually three to four days in length, focus on management skills, problem-solving, or other topics of special interest. School districts pay the living expenses of their administrators who attend, but there is no registration fee. Districts are required to send a team of administrators if they wish to participate. Approximately six weeks prior to the seminar, each district team identifies the problem which concerns them and they complete a basic information form. The following week an academy consultant visits the team in the district and spends a day with them preparing their agenda and making plans for the academy training. During the seminar, resource people work with each team to analyze all aspects of their problem and to examine solution strategies and design an action plan. Approximately six weeks later the academy consultant makes a follow-up visit to the local site. Evaluation of the academy training (done mostly by participant surveys, some as long as a year after the training) shows that the academy causes significant positive changes in aedministrator behavior.

Maryland is another state that uses the executive academy concept. The Maryland Professional Development Academy was established in 1977 and works mostly with principals and assistant principals because their research confirms that these are the people who have significant impact on instructional programs. The Maryland model consists of:

1. statewide needs assessment training for principals
2. one-day planning sessions with those who will be summer institute participants
3. a week-long summer institute
4. follow-up activities, which can include two-day sessions (in fall and spring) for those who attended the summer institute, inservice training for other principals in the system provided through a grant from the Academy, or staff inservice within schools through grants from the Academy
5. evaluation

As in Pennsylvania, the evaluations show positive changes as a result of the training.

Zigarmi (1981) describes a model staff development program which was conducted as a result of a district-wide needs assessment in which school site administrators identified needs for training in (1) organizational leadership, (2) school climate leadership, and (3) instructional leadership. In response to these needs the district's staff development office offered three one-day workshops over a four-month period and provided follow-up alternatives. The first two workshops were designed to give participants theoretical understanding of the concepts of leadership style and organizational climate; in the third workshop individual principals received and analyzed data about their staff's perceptions of their own leadership style and their school's climate.

More specifically, Workshop 1, based on the work of Hersey and Blanchard, focused on helping principals identify leader behaviors which indicated specific leadership styles (various combinations of initiating structure and of consideration behavior which were discussed in an earlier section of this paper), decide what leadership style fit what situation, and become aware of their own style of leadership. Workshop 2 dealt with defining and measuring school climate, recognizing its impact, and generating building level strategies for positively influencing it. Following Workshop 2 and prior to Workshop 3, all teachers working with principals who were participating in the training were asked to complete survey instruments which assessed their perceptions of their principal's leadership style and of their school's climate. Data was collected anonymously at meetings conducted by staff development personnel. These data were computer analyzed and, at the third workshop, each principal received a printout showing his/her perceived leadership and school climate. Principals were given opportunity to analyze the data, to note the difference between their school's climate and district norms and between teachers' perceptions of their leadership style and their own perception, to understand the results of teacher self-assessments about maturity in relation to five tasks, and to analyze the appropriateness of their leadership style to teacher task maturity and possible effects their leadership style had on school climate. The findings were discussed in non-structured conferences between the individual principals and the workshop leader.

Zigarmi emphasizes that follow-up is critical to the success of this model, and suggests that it might be provided in several ways. One way is for the school district to provide ongoing opportunity for each principal to have one-to-one interaction with the workshop leader. Another is to provide in-house staff development personnel who have rapport and skills necessary to give continuing support. A third possibility is to bring together a group of principals with similar profiles and problems, perhaps initially facilitated by the consultant but eventually functioning on its own and providing mutual support.

Also critical to the making and maintenance of change through the training model Zigarmi describes is the recognition by the principals that data collection and analysis must be ongoing if problem-solving is to be efficient and effective. In addition to the data on school climate and leadership, outcome data (student achievement, absenteeism, etc.) should be included.

Some school districts are implementing an "Issues Seminar" model for training principals and other administrators. One such effort is occurring in the San Francisco Schools, where the model used is an adaptation of the Lasswell "Decision Seminars" technique. Each seminar includes a core group of principals who meet together every two weeks with a "neutral" group process facilitator in a "problem-solving culture." The seminars meet in a "chart and map room" which has constantly updated information displays that help people to analyze what has occurred in the district in the past, what is occurring at present, and to project what future trends are likely to be. Sometimes outside "experts" are brought in to speak to priority issues. A five-step problem-solving process is used: goal clarificiation, trend description, analysis of conditions, projection of developments, and selection of alternatives. The salient points from each meeting are recorded in this five-topic context, so that these so-called "Selections" show what was done in each area of the process in the meeting. These Selections are distributed to each member prior to the following meeting. A steering committee drawn from the seminar group monitors progress and assists with evaluation.

Another approach to leadership training is that provided by the /I/D/E/A/ Principals' Inservice Program, based in Dayton, Ohio. /I/D/E/A/, the Institute for Development of Educational Activities, is a division of the Charles F. Kettering Foundation. A local district can opt to participate in the Principals' Inservice Program if they have a group of six to ten principals and can identify a facilitator. The facilitator is required to have two weeks of clinical training and the district bears the cost of that person's expenses during that time (plus a $300 training fee). The facilitator then holds a two-and-a-half to three-day session with the principals who will form the collegial support group during which the focus is on team/group skills. Thereafter each group meets monthly for five-and-a-half-hour sessions built around identified topics and local needs, using program materials and processes to achieve program outcomes. This is a year-long process with the overall goal of helping principals improve their professional competencies so that they can improve school programs for students.

Several of the training sites for facilitators of the /I/D/E/A/ Principals' Inservice Program were held in the CEMREL region during the summer of 1981. Training is typically held in a college setting where reasonable rates for room and board are available. Contact person for this program is James C. LaPlant, Mail Location #2, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH 45221.

The Department of Educational Administration at Iowa State University is beginning to implement a Center for Administrator Professional Development model, or "assessment center," as a part of activity funded under a grant for a School Improvement Model. They are working in Des Moines and in other parts of Iowa through the Area Education Agencies as well as in Minnesota. The assessment center is a method rather than a place and involves the use of peers as assessors. The first step is the formulation of a statement of the center objectives, which have to do with assessment for improvement and not for judgments relating to job security. Each center has a coordinator who is, or can become, familiar with the district, is trained in training and has good interpersonal and problem-solving skills. It is the coordinator's job to make job analyses and decide what measurable, observable behaviors are to be the foci of center activities. S/he either develops or buys exercises pertinent to those behaviors. Center participants are those who have the same job description; it is important that peers are assessing performance rather than having it done by superordinates. The coordinator provides two to three days of training for assessors (also called "developers") in assessment and simulation activities and then conducts a workshop in which perhaps five principals serve as developers and five as trainees. This is usually a three-day session including two days of interviews, in-basket exercises and analysis of responses to problem-solving situations. On the third day the trainees get feedback, their behavior in the workshop is reviewed in depth, strengths and weaknesses are specified and a professional development plan is developed. Contact person for this program is James Sweeney, Department of Educational Administration, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011.

The University of Oregon, in cooperation with the California School Administrators Association, is implementing "Project Leadership." The project, begun in August 1980, has developed and is testing a model for training and dissemination which makes use of handbooks and guides for ninety-minute workshops conducted by administrators for administrators. The guides were originally developed by the California School Administrators Association. Some of them are being revised by the University researchers to include the latest research on the topic treated. This project, now being tested in two states, builds on their research findings that administrators prefer to be trained by other administrators rather than "outsiders," and demonstrates that collaboration between a professional organization and a university can be productive. Contact person for this program is Nancy Pitner, Center for Educational Policy and Management, College of Education, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon 97403.

Another program available is called Administrators-for-Change Training (ACT), offered by a nonprofit corporation, Pedamorphosis, in Lubbock, Texas. They have developed a needs assessment instrument which can be used to help school districts determine which of their several training modules might best meet local management needs. One module is titled "Instructional Leadership: A Systems Approach" and includes such components as school-wide goal setting and action planning, school organization and subgroup action planning, performance planning, clinical supervision, staff development, performance management, and performance evaluation. Pedamorphosis training is offered in a variety of time patterns and costs vary with the number of people involved. Some of their work is done in collaboration with the faculty at Texas Tech University. Contact person for the program is Karolyn J. Snyder, 1220 Broadway, Suite 408, Lubbock, Texas 79401.

The work of CFK, Ltd. and CADRE has been cited earlier in the discussion of school climate improvement processes. They have also developed a training model for administrators called Individualized Continuing Education (ICE) which is described in a paper by Edward Brainard (1973). ICE is a process by which administrators can link their own inservice education and professional growth to planned school improvement projects. In this model, one or two administrators are designated to provide leadership for the development of the school district's plan of administrative continuing education. The program coordinator may be a principal, a central office administrator, perhaps someone with staff development responsibilities; the position s/he holds is less important than the ability to facilitate the development of maximum involvement of participants according to their self-renewal needs and the improvement needs of their schools, as *they* see them. Participation in the program is voluntary. Those who elect to participate form collegial teams of eight to twelve administrators who then develop their own learning plans and activities. A common approach is the identification of school improvement efforts that each administrator would like to facilitate within his/her own school and, along with that, the identification of his/her own administrative skills that need improvement in order to facilitate that effort. The teams of administrators plan and learn together and often organize periodic seminars pertaining to topics of common need. However, each participant works on his/her own needs at his/her own pace while at the same time having available the support and expertise of other administrators in the team. The school district provides outside consultants when there is a need for expertise beyond the group, and permits teams to set aside varying blocks of time (usually from two- to six-hour sessions) for monthly team meetings. A *Self Performance Achievement Record* (SPAR) is recommended as a guide for the planning process. The process involves describing a school improvement project in terms of a goal, activities which would be occurring if the goal were being practiced, and evidences of success in achieving the goals and objectives. It provides a format for describing the timeline for initiating and completing the project, progress reports to the collegial learning team, and one's individualized continuing education plan which answers the questions, "Given the school improvement project, what new abilities do you need to achieve the project and how will you obtain each new need?" A school district's direct cost for such an individualized continuing education program for school administrators is largely within the categories of consultant services and any travel funds which individuals or teams might need to help them achieve their goals. The Brainard paper, "Individualizing Administrator Continuing Education," which describes the process and its possible variations in detail, is available for $4.00 from CADRE, 1125 Moline, Aurora, Colorado 80010.

Another leadership training model currently in use is the Danforth School Administrators Fellowship Program, begun in 1973. The Danforth Foundation, in St. Louis, selects from three to five cities for participation each year. The superintendents of the districts chosen each recommend five senior high school principals as Fellows, who agree to devote the equivalent of one day per week to professional development activity. The Foundation also chooses a local coordinator (a university professor) to help local principals select and plan their year's activity. All participating principals and coordinators attend a weeklong orientation in August to set basic structures for the program. Resource persons are provided and superintendents are invited for a part of the orientation. Throughout the year two-day meetings are held in each of the cities for all participants. They can share experiences and visit programs in each other's schools. The Danforth Program tries to help principals set their own goals, gain new skills, and network with others.

The Community Relations Service of the U.S. Department of Justice has developed a model for training leaders (not only school administrators, but representatives of all school-involved groups) in human relations skills to assist with desegregation. This model was used in Syracuse in 1977 and later, with modifications, by the Colorado Education Association; University City, Missouri; Lubbock, Texas; and other cities. The model consists of four workshops designed to develop a human relations team of staff and parents at each school. Part of that workshop content is a diagnosis of school climate, through use of a checklist especially oriented toward a multi-cultural approach. Syracuse used the plan successfully; they had "nothing near organized violence" as they desegregated under order from the state commissioner of education in a situation of declining enrollment and a dramatic increase in percentage of minority students.

Other types of training for leadership are provided by professional organizations. For instance, the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) schedules workshops at the annual convention, has a special contract program for seminars for individual school districts, and conducts the National Academy for School Executives (NASE). It provides five-day seminars, two-and-a-half day skill and orientation institutes, and one-day mini-institutes.

The National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), in addition to their annual convention, conducts the National Institute for Secondary School Administrators, a venture begun with help from Danforth but now self-supporting. The Institute provides institutes and programs in various cities, consulting to local districts, and conferences for assistant principals.

The National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) has an annual convention and co-sponsors, with universities, summer workshops.

The National School Public Relations Association (NSPRA) conducts an annual seminar program, regional workshops, and provides consulting to local districts.

The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) sponsors two to three day institutes in various cities on a number of topics of interest to administrators and other school staff, as well as at the annual convention.

Given that research places considerable stress on high expectations by teachers and principals as indicators of effective schools, a description is included here of the TESA Program, even though it is primarily intended for teachers rather than administrators. TESA (Teacher Expectations and Student Achievement) was developed by the Equal Opportunity in the Classroom Project in Los Angeles in 1971. It is coordinated in each school district by district staff who have been trained at Coordinator Training Seminars and consists of five three-hour workshops, one month apart, to help develop awareness of differential treatment in the classroom and to teach an interaction model designed to eliminate such treatment. The workshops deal with three factors--response opportunities, feedback, and personal regard. During the month between workshops, participants develop their skills by practicing the interaction model in their classes and by observing and coding each other a minimum of four times and sharing the results of those observations. Use of this model has been shown to result in statistically significant academic gains, reduction in absenteeism, and reduction in disciplinary referrals. Training for local coordinators requires three days, and is offered at three sites: Los Angeles, Shaker Heights, Ohio; and Tallahassee, Florida. Contact person for the project is Sam Kerman, Los Angeles County Education Center, 9300 E. Imperial Hwy., Downey, CA 90242.

There are several sources of training pertinent to cooperative learning techniques, which the research emphasizes is vital both in the classroom and in inservice for teachers and administrators. David and Roger Johnson, professors at the University of Minnesota who have done extensive research on learning structures, conduct five-day workshops focusing on the application of cooperative learning to educational settings. The workshops are for teachers and administrators in all subject areas and age groups. Participants have the opportunity to learn how to teach cooperative skills to their students and how to use cooperative learning for working together with others in preservice, inservice and staff development programs. In the summer of 1981 these workshops were held at the Sagamore Conference Center in New York. Detailed information can be obtained from Cooperative Learning, 162 Windsor Lane, New Brighton, MN 55112.

Training in Student Team Learning, a set of techniques developed at the Center for Social Organization of Schools, The Johns Hopkins University, is available throughout the United States. The Johns Hopkins staff has trained a number of certified trainers who can provide standard workshop training to teachers and others interested in the team learning approach. The Student Team Learning techniques have been approved for dissemination by the National Diffusion Network, and state facilitators can provide assistance to school districts that wish to adopt them. For more detailed information, contact Ruth Carter, Center for Social Organization of Schools, 3505 N. Charles Street, Baltimore, MD 21218.

The University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) is a private, non-profit consortium consisting of 47 universities and 30 school systems in the United States and Canada. It has been partially funded by the Kellogg Foundation. UCEA's purpose is to improve the professional preparation of administrative personnel in education, both through preservice and inservice training. The Council has developed many instructional materials, often in the form of simulations. One of the major simulations--"Monroe City"--is intended for use by urban school administrators. Simulations include background information on schools and communities, information on specific leadership roles, sets of in-basket items including letters, memos, and other written stimuli; taped and filmed materials, including emergency "interruptions" and special materials to assist instructors. These simulation materials are distributed to educators at cost, but a condition of sale of the major sets of materials is that someone from the purchasing agency be trained in their use. This requirement may be fulfilled by attendance at an intensive two-day workshop, an apprenticeship as an assistant to a professor or administrator who has experience in use of the materials, or a workshop at the user site. UCEA is located at Ohio State University, 29 West Woodruff Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43210.

SUMMARY

Reflecting on what has been said, what can be said? Are there major themes that organize the information or, failing that, pieces of information whose significance arrests us with implications for action? What sense is there to be made of a collection of material which perhaps includes little that experience and thought have not already told us? For each reader, the answers may be different. Some possible answers are these:

Speaking abstractly, one theme is this: out of abundance, one gives. Speaking somewhat more concretely: out of his/her own feelings that life is satisfying and productive, a leader leads. Out of such feelings one is sufficiently released from preoccupation with self to devote attention to the needs of others that is essential to leadership. Out of such feelings the belief that one's efforts can improve one's situation is sustained and one is not overtaken by despair or complacency. If these assertions are true, perhaps we must question whether the criteria used in selecting people for positions where leadership is essential (such as the principalship) reveal these pertinent characteristics. Probably we must examine whether the preparation of potential leaders is consistent with the development of genuine self-esteem and, to coin a phrase, life-esteem. Certainly we must search seriously for ways to encourage those esteems in people already in positions of leadership but without the personal abundance from which to lead. We may well ask, "To what extent are positive attitudes and behaviors the result of training andother experience? Or are they ultimately a conscious choice that an individual makes, perhaps in spite of education and experience?"

Another facet of this theme: out of abundance, one expects, one assumes. Out of one's self-esteem and life-esteem, emerges other-esteem. Out of perceiving oneself as able and willing to contribute, one assumes others to be (at least potentially) similarly motivated and responsible. Out of such assumptions about others, one can concentrate on helping rather than blaming. Without such assumptions, one does not believe, "We can." Without such assumptions, one is ill-prepared to interact with others as effective leadership requires.

Another theme: the leader initiates, is active as well as responsive. But what is it that the leader initiates? On closer examination of the indicators of effective leaders, one is attracted to the conclusion that the leader initiates cooperation. How? By cooperating--by initiating practices and processes that take into account the desires and dignity of others, whether by shared decision-making, open communication, participative problem-solving or other ways. The leader initiates cooperation not only by personal example but also by establishing and encouraging cooperative structures, whether that means collegial teams in inservice activities or teaching or learning teams in classrooms.

That brings us to the concurrent theme that out of such cooperative structures (compared to competitive or individualistic structures) comes increased motivation, self-esteem, and respect for the dignity and ability of others, as well as increased achievement and productivity. Given this data, we might productively ask ourselves how teacher and administrator preparation and inservice programs would look different if they emphasized cooperative learning and student-student interaction. How would curriculum design change? We might also productively ask ourselves why the theme of cooperative learning has not been taken with greater seriousness in the past. And we might ask ourselves whether we take it seriously now.

Some further, perhaps less elusive, guidelines that emerge:

"Good" school climate begins, continues, and ends with the school principal (with varying degrees of help from his/her friends--teachers, students, parents, central administrators, and community). The principal who is an effective leader for school climate improvement knows that good climate consists of a correlation of productivity (the we-can-DO-it phenomena) and satisfaction (the WE-can-do-it phenomena). The principal as effective school climate leader assesses the situation thoughtfully, and if what s/he sees is the we-can't-do-it phenomena, or the we-don't-want-to-do-it phenomena, s/he works at raising awareness of the possibilities for and benefits of improvement efforts rather than beginning such efforts prematurely and thereby contributing further evidence to the we-can't-do-it subscribers. A school climate improvement project is better not begun if there is not broad support for the effort, if the motivation in doing it is to expose the unproductive or the dissatisfied rather than to help them become more productive and/or satisfied, and if there is not a commitment of sufficient resources and time (at least two years, most researchers agree) to enable the effort to succeed.

During a school climate improvement project, the leader is responsible for keeping the focus on the goals, which should include product as well as process components. By so doing, s/he assures that the multidimensional nature of school climate does not distract people into activities which may be interesting but irrelevant. S/he keeps perspective about the always kaleidoscopic, in-flux nature of school environment, knows that that nature precludes simple, single solutions to climate problems, and recognizes that what increases satisfaction and productivity for some may decrease it for others in the same environment. In that context, it is vital that the leader keep the vision fixed on the reason for it all--that all students might have learning, and have it abundantly.

The effective school climate leader, then, is something of a juggler--a balance-seeker who does not expect climate to be static or its improvement ever to be complete, and who meets the continuing challenge to improvise with a judicious mixture of determination and good humor. If we despair of finding such people, or of helping them grow, we confess that we are not leaders either.

REFERENCES

Ames, Carole. "Competitive Versus Cooperative Reward Structures: The Influence of Individual and Group Performance Factors on Achievement Attributions and Affect." *American Educational Research Journal*, *18*, 3 (Fall 1981) 273-287.

Austin, Gilbert R. "Exemplary Schools and the Search for Effectiveness." *Educational Leadership*, October 1979.

Balderson, James H. "Principal Power Bases, Some Observations." *Canadian Administrator 14*, 7 (April 1975): 1-5. Abstract in *Best of the Best of ERIC*, Vol. 2.

Beckum, Leonard D. and Dasho, Stefan J. *Multi-Ethnic School Environments*. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1980.

Best of the Best of ERIC, Vol. 2. Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon, ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management,

Bickel, Frank and Qualls, Robert. "The Impact of School Climate on Suspension Rates in the Jefferson County Public Schools." *The Urban Review*, *2*, 2 (1980).

Bogue, E.G. "One Foot in the Stirrup." *Phi Delta Kappan*, April 1972.

Brainard, Edward. *Individualizing Administrator Continuing Education*. Denver, Colorado: CFK, Ltd. 1973.

Breckenridge, Eileen. "Improving School Climate." *Phi Delta Kappan*, December 1976.

Brophy, Jere E. *Teacher Praise: A Functional Analysis*. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, October 1979.

Burns, Thomas J., chairman. *The Urban High School Reform Initiative Final Report*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, September 1979.

Cincinnati Public Schools' Educational Climate Improvement Process, 1980.

Clark, Frank J. *Improving the School Climate*, Operations Notebook No. 19 Association of California School Administrators, October 1977.

Classroom Discipline. The Best of ERIC, No. 52. Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon, ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, April 1980.

Cooper, Harris M. Communication of Teacher Expectations to Students. Paper presented at conference at University of Pittsburgh, October 1979. Columbia, Mo.: Center for Research in Social Behavior.

Cooper, Harris M.; Baron, Reuben M.; and Lowe, Charles A. "The Importance of Race and Social Class Information in the Formation of Expectancies About Academic Performance." Journal of Educational Psychology 67, 2 (1975).

Cooper, Harris M. "Pygmalion Grows Up: A Model for Teacher Expectation Communication and Performance Influence." Review of Educational Research 49, 3 (Summer, 1979): 389-410.

_____. "Some Effects of Performance Information on Academic Expectations." Journal of Educational Psychology 71, 3 (1979): 375-380.

Cunningham, Luvern L. "Educational Leadership: The Curious Blend." Educational Leadership, February 1976.

Damico, Sandra; Bell-Nathaniel, Afresa; and Green, Charles. The Affective Middle School and Its Inter-racial Climate. Paper presented at AERA, 1980.

Danforth School Administrators Fellowship Program. St. Louis, Mo.: The Danforth Foundation, 1980.

DeGracie, James S. and Rule, Judy G. Attitude Change by Grade Level of Selected Publics Toward School Environment. Mesa, Arizona: Mesa Public Schools.

Detroit Public Schools Management Academy; Management Development Seminars 1980-81.

Edmonds, Ronald. A Discussion of the Literature and Issues Related to Effective Schooling. St. Louis, Mo.: CEMREL, Inc., 1978.

Epstein, Joyce L., and McPartland, James. Quality of School Life. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Center for Social Organization of Schools, 1976.

Erickson, Donald A., and Reller, Theodore L., eds. Principal in Metropolitan Schools. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Co., 1979.

Estadt, Gary J.; Willower, Donald J.; and Caldwell, William E. "School Principals' Role Administration Behavior and Teachers' Pupil Control Behavior: A Test of the Domino Theory." Contemporary Education 47, 4 (Summer 1976): 207-212. Abstract in Best of Best of ERIC, Vol. 2.

70

Fairman, Marvin; Holmes, Morris; Hardage, James; Lucas, Connie Showalter. *Manual for The Organizational Health Instrument*. Fayetteville, Arkansas: Organizational Health: Diagnosis and Development Corporation, 1979.

Findings from Elementary School Climate and School Achievement Study. East Lansing, Mich.: College of Urban Development, Michigan State University, 1979.

Fraser, B.J. "Role of Classroom Environment in Curriculum Evaluation." *NWREL Newsletter 3*, 1 (July 1980). Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

Freiburg, H. Jerome and Buckley, P.K. *Maintaining and Improving School Climate in Urban Schools*. Paper presented at annual meeting AERA, Los Angeles, 1981.

Ginsburg, Mark B.; Buckley, Pamela K.; Freiburg, H. Jerome; Townsend, Karan; and Laufman, Larry. *Two Year Study of Changes in School Climate in Four Urban Schools: Findings and Participants Theories*. Paper presented at annual meeting, AERA, Los Angeles, 1981.

Good, Thomas L. "Teacher Expectations and Student Perceptions: A Decade of Research." *Educational Leadership*, February 1981.

Gorton, Richard A., and McIntyre, Kenneth E. *The Senior High School Principalship*, Vol. 2. Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School principals, 1978. Abstract in *Best of Best of ERIC*, Vol. 2.

Gunderson, Barbara and Johnson, David. "Building Positive Attitudes by Using Cooperative Learning Groups." *Foreign Language Annals 13*, 1 (1980): 39-43.

Hathaway, Douglas V. "Discontinuities in Educational Goals." AERA Division G: *The Generator*, 13, 3 (Spring, 1981): 21-19.

Herriott, Robert E. and Gross, Neal, eds. *Dynamics of Planned Educational Change* Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Co., 1979.

How Effective Are Your Schools? A Checklist for Citizens. Washington, D.C.: Council for Basic Education.

Howard, Eugene R. *Action Guide: How to Conduct a School Climate Mini-Audit*. Denver, Colo.: Colorado Department of Education.

_____. "How Important is School Climate?" Penney's Forum. New York, N.Y.: J.C. Penney Consumer Affairs.

_____. Implementing School Climate Improvement Activities. Suggested working documents. Denver, Colo.: Colorado Department of Education.

_____. "Improving Discipline Through Unrigging the School." Noteworthy. Denver, Colo: Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory.

_____. Improving School Climate. A Staff Development/School Improvement Process Leader's Guide. Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1980.

_____. Improving Your School's Climate: An Antidote to Alienation. Denver, Colo.: Colorado Department of Education.

_____. Some Ideas on Improving School Climate. Denver, Colo.: Colorado Department of Education, March, 1980.

Howell, Bruce. "Profile of the Principalship." Educational Leadership, January, 1981, 333-336.

Huge, James. "The Principal as Staff Development Leader." Educational Leadership, February 1977.

Human Relations: A Guide for Leadership Training in the Public Schools. Summary Report on a project with the Syracuse, N.Y., School System. Community Relations Service, U.S. Department of Justice.

Hunt, David E. "Person-Environment Interaction: A Challenge Found Wanting Before It Was Tried." Review of Educational Research 45, 2 (Spring 1975): 209-230.

/I/D/E/A Principals' Inservice Program: An Overview. Dayton, Ohio: Institute for Development of Educational Activities, 1980.

Improving School Climate. The Best of ERIC, No. 32. Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon, ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, December 1977.

Inservice Programs for Educational Administrators and Supervisors. Educational Research Service, Inc.

Jefferson County Public Schools, Louisville, Kentucky: A Look at the Middle School: Training Resource Packets for Middle School Principals (includes Middle School Self-Assessment Instrument) 1980-81.

Johnson, David W. "Student-Student Interaction: The Neglected Variable in Education." Educational Research 10, 1 (January 1981): 5-10.

Johnson, David W., and Johnson, Roger T. Cooperative Learning: The Power of Positive Goal Interdependence. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.

_____. "Cooperative, Competitive, and Individualistic Learning." Journal of Research and Development in Education 12, 1 (1978).

_____. "The Key to Effective Inservice: Building Teacher-Teacher Collaboration." The Developer, February 1980.

Johnson, David W., Skon, Linda; and Johnson, Roger. "Effects of Cooperative, Competitive, and Individualistic Conditions on Children's Problem-solving Performance." American Educational Research Journal 17, 1 (Spring 1980): 83-93.

Johnson, David W.; Maruyama, Geoffrey; Johnson, Roger; Nelson, Deborah; and Skon, Linda. "The Effects of Cooperative, Competitive and Individualistic Goal Structures on Achievement: A Meta-Analysis." Psychological Bulletin, 1981, (in press).

Kelley, Edgar A. Climate Development for Schools: Principles and Practices. Reston, Va.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1980.

LaPlant, James. Inservice Education for Principals (The State of the Art). Dayton, Ohio: Institute for Development of Educational Activities, Inc., 1980.

_____. Principals' Inservice Program. Dayton, Ohio: Institute for Development of Educational Activities, Inc., August 1979.

Leadership Effectiveness. The Best of ERIC, No. 34. Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon, ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, February 1978.

Leadership: Improving Its Effectiveness. Research Action Brief, No. 1. Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon, ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, January 1978.

Little, Judith Warren. School Success and Staff Development in Urban Desegregated Schools: A Summary of Recently Completed Research. Paper presented at annual meeting AERA, Los Angeles, 1981.

Logan, Carolyn H. Ellis. "An Ecological Approach to Understanding Leadership." AERA Division G: The Generator, 11, 3 (1981): 43-54.

McMillan, James H., ed. Social Psychology of School Learning. New York: Academic Press, 1980.

Managerial Control: A Middle Way. Research Action Brief. Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon, ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, 1978.

Marshall, Gail. An Evaluation of Issues Seminar in the St. Louis Public Schools. St. Louis, Mo. 1980.

Maryland Professional Development Academy. Baltimore: Maryland Department of Education.

Maynard, William. "The Impact of a Humanistic School Climate." NASSP Bulletin, April 1976.

Miller, Stephen K. "Changing the School Learning Climate: Overcoming Resistance to Change." AERA Division G: The Generator, 11, 3 (1981): 1-20.

Miller, William C. "Can a Principal's Improved Behavior Result in Higher Pupil Achievement?" Educational Leadership, February 1976.

Moos, Rudolph, and Trickett, Edison. Classroom Environment Scale (Manual and Overview). Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc., 1974.

Morgan, James W. "Recognizing Students' Positive Behavior." Educational Leadership, November 1980.

Morris, Van Cleve; Crowson, Robert L.; Hurwitz, Emanuel Jr.; and Porter-Gehrie, Cynthia. The Urban Principal: Discretionary Decision-making in a Large Educational Organization. Chicago,: College of Education, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle, 1981.

Novotney, Jerrold M., and Tye, Kenneth A. Dynamics of Educational Leadership. Los Angeles, California: Educational Resource Associates, Inc., 1973.

Passalacqua, Joseph. "The School Social Organization: Suggestions for Change." AERA Division G: The Generator, 11, 3 (1981): 30-42.

Pennsylvania Executive Academy. Harrisburg, Pa.: Pennsylvania Department of Education.

Peterson, Kent. Making Sense of Principals' Work. Paper presented at AERA, 1981.

Piele, Philip K. New Programs for Training School Administrators: Analysis of Literature and Selected Bibliography. Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon, ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Administration, 1970.

Pilot Study of School Climate 1975-76. Boston, Mass.: Massachusetts Educational Assessment Program, Massachusetts Department of Education.

Pitner, Nancy. Training of Administrators: What Relation to Managerial Work? Paper presented at AERA, 1981.

Presseisen, Barbara Z., ed. School Governance and Classroom Climate: Concerns of Theory and Practice in Citizen Education. Philadelphia, Pa.: Research for Better Schools, Inc., 1980.

Puckett, Myron. Issues Seminars--A Staff Development Program for Principals. San Francisco, California: The San Francisco Center for Public Education.

Pyper, John R., Freiburg, H.J., Ginsburg, M., and Spuck, D.W. School Climate Questionnaires: Instruments to Measure Teacher, Parent and Student Perceptions of School Climate. Paper presented at annual meeting AERA, Los Angeles, 1981.

Relic, Peter D., and Griffin, Patrick J. "Clearing the Air on School Administrator Training." American Education, May 1979.

Richman, Joel and Stern, George G. Stern Personality and Environment Indexes: A User's Technical Manual. (Also known as the Syracuse Indexes).

Rosenblum, Sheila, Jastrzab, JoAnn, et al. The Role of the Principal in Change: The Teacher Corps Example. Cambridge, Mass.: Abt Associates, 1980.

Rutter, M. et al. Fifteen Thousand Hours. London: Open Books, 1979.

Saario, Terry T. "Leadership and the Change Process: Preparing Educational Administrators." Dynamics of Planned Educational Change, Herriott and Gross, eds. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Co., 1979.

School Climate Handbook. Boston, Mass.: Massachusetts Educational Assessment Program, Massachusetts Department of Education, 1977.

School Climate. Research Action Brief No. 4. Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon, ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, February 1978.

Sexton, Michael J., and Switzer, Karen Dawn Dill. "The Time Management Ladder." *Educational Leadership 35*, 6 (March 1978): 482-83, 485-86. Abstract in *Best of the Best of ERIC*.

Sharan, Shlomo. "Cooperative Learning in Small Groups: Recent Methods and Effects on Achievement, Attitudes, and Ethnic Relations." *Review of Educational Research 50*, 2 (Summer 1980): 241-271.

Shoemaker, Joan and Fraser, Hugh W. "What Principals Can Do: Some Implications from Studies of Effective Schooling." *Phi Delta Kappan*, *63*, 3 (November 1981): 178-182.

Slavin, Robert E. "Cooperative Learning." *Review of Educational Research 50*, 2 (Summer 1980): 315-342.

_____. *Cooperative Learning and Desegregation*. Baltimore, Md.: Center for Social Organization of Schools, The Johns Hopkins University, 1980.

Slavin, Robert E. and Oickle, Eileen. *Effects of Learning Teams on Student Achievement and Race Relations in a Desegregated Middle School*. Paper presented at AERA, 1980.

Smith, Karl A. "A Study of the Effects of Structured Controversy Within Cooperative Groups." *Reporting on Cooperative Learning 3*, 1 (January 1981).

Smith, Maxine. "What Makes an Effective School?" *Ohio Elementary Principal*, December 1980.

Spiess, Jack. *Concepts of Leadership*. Abstract in *Best of the Best of ERIC*, 1975.

Stenson, W.L. *CADRE: The Characteristics of a CADRE School*. Report of Conference of Elementary School Climate Improvement League.

Student Behavior and Parental/Community Involvement: Impacting for Change. Lansing, Mich.: Office of School and Community Affairs, Michigan Department of Education, April 1978.

Teacher Corps Program Evaluation. Physical Environment Observation instrument.

Tornatzky, Louisa G.; Brookover, Wilbur B.; Hathaway, Douglas V.; Miller, Stephen K.; Passalacqua, Joseph. "Changing School Climate: A Case Study in Implementation." *Urban Education 15*, 2 (July 1980): 183-188.

Washington, Valora. "The Role of Teacher Behavior in School Desegregation." *Educational Horizons*, Spring 1979.

Why Do Some Urban Schools Succeed? The Phi Delta Kappa Study of Exceptional Urban Elementary Schools. Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa, 1980.

Wichita Climate Surveys. Wichita, Ks.: Wichita Public Schools.

Wiggins, Thomas W. "Principal Behavior in the School Climate: A Systems Analysis." *Educational Technology 11*, 9 (September 1971): 57-59. Abstract in *Best of the Best of ERIC*.

Williams, Richard C. "Implementing Practices in Elementary Schools Based on Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study, Implications for the Principal." Denham, Carolyn and Lieberman, Ann, eds. *Time to Learn*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education/National Institute of Education, 1980.

Wright, William E., Jesness, Carl F. *Delinquency in a Seventh-Grade Cohort: Impact of School Climate on Problem Behavior*. Sacramento, California: California State Department of the Youth Authority, April 1979.

Zigarmi, Drea. "Leadership and School Climate: A Data-Based Approach to Administrative Training." *The Journal of Staff Development 2*, 1 (May 1981): 93-115.

DESCRIPTIONS OF SOME SCHOOL CLIMATE IMPROVEMENT EFFORTS CURRENTLY OCCURRING IN THE URBAN EDUCATION NETWORK

Akron Public Schools

The Akron Public Schools are approaching improved school climate through a series of related seminars on the following topics:

(1) Effective Discipline
(2) Middle Schools
(3) Grouping for Instruction
(4) Learning and Teaching Styles
(5) Building Positive Self-Concept in Students

One of the remarkable characteristics of these seminars is that, with one exception, they are conducted wholly or in part by selected Akron teachers.

The seminar on Effective Discipline is a four-hour presentation which reviews various approaches to discipline, uses a cassette/filmstrip series on assertive discipline, and includes small-group discussions by grade level.

The Middle School workshop is a sixteen-week, one hour per week effort which offers participants an hour of credit through a local university. It emphasizes topics such as the characteristics and needs of the middle school child and suitable educational programs and facilities for middle school students. Field trips and on-site participation are included.

The Grouping for Instruction workshop is intended for secondary teachers. During the four hours involved, the focus is on helping teachers develop techniques to conduct simultaneous, small-group learning activities within the classroom. Participants are grouped according to content area taught, with different presenters for each area to ensure that the techniques presented will be appropriate for the teachers' needs.

The Learning and Teaching styles workshop is a thirteen-hour activity, again offering an hour of college credit to participants. The focus in this seminar is on becoming aware of teacher attitudinal perceptions about learning style, understanding teacher learning style, learning the implications of the teacher's style on others, and choosing appropriate teaching styles to address the needs of learners.

The Building Positive Self-Concept in Students offering was a one-hour lecture attended by more than 500 Akron teachers and administrators.

During the 1980-81 school year, the Akron Personnel Department set a goal for more principal visibility, urging that principals schedule one classroom visit per day per administrator. That goal was accompanied by a series of seminars on effective classroom observation and evaluation. Monthly reports indicated that from September through May elementary principals averaged .93 visits per day and secondary administrators averaged .85 visits per day.

Cincinnati Public Schools

In the spring of 1980 an Educational Climate Study Group was constituted in the Cincinnati Public Schools. The Group, composed of central administration representatives of all departments in the school system, recommended to the Superintendent's Cabinet that a proposed district-wide goalsetting activity be postponed. Instead, they recommended that priority be given to the development of a system

79

responsive to a need for a more cooperative, humane working climate. The Group's recommendations were adopted and an Educational Climate Improvement Process begun with the development of an Educational Climate Survey Instrument and a series of Training in Process sessions for Branch/Area/Office heads and their process facilitators. These facilitators then conducted two two-hour meetings with all central office staff during which the Survey was completed and some consensus reached on which of the climate-related needs should get priority. (The needs included those for more cooperative behavior, better communication, a feeling of ownership in the educational process, a support system; incentives for initiative leadership and creativity; a sense of community with schools, and improvement of the process of delegation of responsibility). Once the top priority needs were affirmed, the groups generated solutions related to meeting the needs and developed plans for implementing them.

Subsequently this process was carried out at all levels in the district, including the individual school building staffs. When it was successfully completed, the district-wide goalsetting activity was resumed. The total process is now seen as an ongoing activity in which goalsetting attends to meeting needs in the work environment as well as in academic areas.

Columbus Public Schools

More than a hundred Columbus teachers participated in the Teacher Expectation and Student Achievement (TESA) Training Program during the 1980-81 school year. The group included senior high, middle school, and elementary teachers as well as two principals.

An initial grant of $15,000 from the Ohio Department of Education provided funding for the training of twelve local TESA coordinators who train the teachers. The teachers volunteer their time to attend after school/evening workshop sessions because the district does not have the resources to provide released time.

Columbus has also provided an Assertive Discipline workshop for elementary administrators and teachers and a city-wide administrators workshop on effective schooling with Ronald Edmonds.

The Detroit Public Schools

The Detroit Public Schools piloted the Teacher Expectation and Student Achievement (TESA) program in 1979-1980, during which 90 teachers were trained in its use. During 1980-81, 225 teachers were involved in the training; wherever possible training was done on a released time basis with substitutes provided.

Data from the pilot efforts in 1979-80 demonstrated that low student expectations existed and that teachers expected less from higher percentages of black students than white students. After the concentrated training effort changed teacher behavior in the classroom, teacher perceptions of student performance were also found to have changed in a positive manner.

The Detroit Public Schools Management Academy provides leadership training to administrators and supervisors at central, regional, and school levels. The Management Academy has five components:

(1) Required sessions that deal with topics critical to all system managers in order to facilitate the coordination and integration of scarce human and physical resources in a decentralized school system

(2) Elective sessions open to all system administrators and supervisors on topics that expand or complement the concepts developed in required sessions

(3) Principal's Round Table (Problem Solving Seminars) which provide local school principals with an opportunity to informally interact, share, and discuss with peers common problems and concerns that arise out of the day-to-day operation of schools. These sessions are typically two hours in length.

(4) Critical Issues Seminars, which are open to all administrators and supervisors except when they are planned for an identified group. These seminars are intended to raise critical questions, develop awareness of present and future system needs and generate alternatives for identified problem areas.

(5) Principalship Promotional Pool component provides essential management skill training to candidates presently in the promotional pool for the position of principal. Enrollment in these sessions is limited to 30 volunteer participants from the pool and does not alter their promotional pool status.

The Academy also provides on request sessions for job-alike work units with a specific training need.

Many of the session topics in all of the components cover topics which relate to leadership for school climate improvement. Some of the 1980-81 offerings of the Academy included: Defusing Confrontation Situations, Overcoming Staff Resistance to Change, Involvement, and Participation; Delegation--Why, How, and When to Do It; Student Attendance; Reassessment and Revitalization of the Urban School; Problem Solving/Decision-Making; Planning for Improved Achievement; Corrective Discipline; Leadership and Team Building; and Oral and Written Communication Skills.

Iowa Department of Education

The Iowa Department of Education has mandated the development of a multicultural, nonsexist education plan in each school district, along with a specific timeline of implementation for a program which promotes the understanding and appreciation of the cultural diversity of our pluralistic society. Special emphasis is to be placed on Asian Americans, Black Americans, Hispanic Americans, Native Americans, and the handicapped. It shall also foster the knowledge of, respect and appreciation for the historical and contemporary contribution of men and women to society as well as those educational processes that reflect the wide variety of roles open to both men and women. School districts have until 1985 to implement such a multicultural, nonsexist education plan. The plan must include specific goals and objectives with implementation timelines for each component; a description of the inservice activities planned for all staff members on multicultural, nonsexist education; evidence of systematic input by men and women, minority groups and the handicapped in the development and implementation of the plan; and a description of a periodic, ongoing system to monitor and evaluate the plan.

The Iowa mandate also provides that resource guides developed for each subject area should reflect multicultural, nonsexist approaches and that instructional materials should reflect the contributions and perspectives of men and women and diverse racial or ethnic groups. Additionally, where sex and cultural or racial stereotyping exists in materials, that should be brought to the attention of students and supplementary materials are to be used to offset the stereotyping. The curriculum is also to include activities which promote an awareness of sexism and cultural bias in the English language.

The School District of Kansas City, Missouri

Two Kansas City school principals are participating in the CEMREL Training Program for Minorities and Women and, as their research project in the project, began conducting a study to determine if improving principals' skills in problem-solving and goal setting would in fact improve organizational effectiveness. Base-line data was gathered through the use of an Organizational Health Instrument.

Next steps in the project have been delayed because of changes in staff assignments and possible reorganization in the district necessitated by uncertainties associated with changes in funding levels. These changes have been accompanied by changes in the district's "Strategic Plan" and additional responsibilities for principals.

The plan had been to train trainers in providing workshops on problem-solving and goal setting who would then train principals throughout the school year so that they would have had opportunity to set goals and solve real problems with the help of the training program. Posttests were to be given to determine the effectiveness of the program both at the end of the first and second years, again using the Organizational Health Instrument. Those data would then be compared with the District Surveys, the number of complaints made and perceptions of principals. It is hoped that the project can be continued at some not too distant future time.

The Kansas City District is beginning implementation of a staff development plan for school improvement which includes climate-related components. The district's long range Strategic Plan has as its major priority the improvement of students' educational achievement and the training project is intended to support the accomplishment of that goal. Teams from participating schools are trained to develop a thirty-hour school improvement workshop to be implemented in their schools. These teams include the principal, two teachers, a supervisor from the district and, in the case of secondary schools, perhaps a counselor as well. They receive training which emphasizes (1) teaching--specifically the management of classroom instruction and time, (2) effective building management and instructional support, and (3) management of tests and curriculum. Of particular relevance to this paper is the component on building management and leadership, which anticipates that, after training, participants will be able to: (1) explain effective building management and its relationship to student achievement; (2) identify major components of successful building management; (3) conduct a systematic assessment of the climate in their building; (4) plan building level changes designed to improve building climate. In addition, participants will have actually conducted a systematic assessment of the climate of their building, worked with building colleagues in the analysis of their building's climate and planned specific changes based on the results and designed to improve those elements of the building's climate found to be less than conducive to improving student achievement.

Jefferson County Public Schools, Louisville, Kentucky

One of the leadership/school climate related activities of the Jefferson County Public Schools in Louisville has been the production of a staff development kit designed for use by middle school principals and school staffs in the system. The kit, titled "A Look at the Middle School," contains five separate, sequential training resource packets:

(1) The Middle School Program--A Historical Overview
(2) Assessing Needs--Local School Self-Study
(3) Teaching Style--The Middle School Teacher
(4) Characteristics and Needs of the Middle School Student
(5) The Desirable Middle School--Teaching Strategies

The district adopted a Comprehensive Middle School Program in 1978-79 and implemented it in 1980-81. The kit was designed and developed by six middle school principals during the summer of 1980 under the direction of the Professional Development Unit. Training was then provided to all other middle school principals in the use of the packets for staff development activities at their school sites.

The needs assessment instrument in the kit is designed for use in program rather than personnel evaluation. It is organized into nine sections, each assessing a component which has been defined as essential for effective middle school programs. The nine sections are: skills continuum in reading and mathematics, teacher-advisor program, development reading, development mathematics, content subjects, unified/practical arts/art/music, physical education/student activities and intramurals, exploratory electives, and state and local programs taught in existing courses. The self-study sheets provide a continuum from minimal to optimal for rating of various indicators of effective implementation of each component. These sheets are completed either by departmental groups or, in some cases, subcommittees of members from a cross-section of departments and the results then noted on summary sheets. Once the self-study sheets are completed, teachers in each department choose the component which is of greatest concern to them and, on a supplementary sheet, develop a brief profile of that component which includes recommendations for improvement of that component. Summary and supplementary sheets are then submitted to the steering committee.

Michigan Department of Education/Detroit Public Schools

A two-year demonstration project called Clean and Safe Schools (CASE) is now being implemented in two high schools and their feeder schools in Detroit. The project is jointly funded by a grant from the Hudson-Webber

Foundation and matching funds from the Detroit Board of Education, the Michigan Department of Education and an urban coalition, New Detroit, Inc.

The project, intended to develop pride, caring and respect of the school, the student body, the administrative staff and the community, will implement several recommendations made by the Governor's Task Force on Violence and Vandalism in the Public Schools. CASE has four components: awareness, pride, beautification and training and counseling of teachers and students. Activities include such things as motivational speakers, poster contests, "Happy Rooms," "Pride Newsletter," communication workshops, "Erase Graffiti" campaigns, and the planting of trees and shrubs. Implementation relies heavily on coordination and cooperation between all segments of the school population and the larger school community.

According to a 1978 report, incidents of violence and vandalism in the Detroit Schools cost the taxpayers over $1 million annually. It is hoped that this project will substantially reduce that amount.

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

The Missouri Department of Education is implementing several school climate related projects. One is a continuing series of workshops dealing with the reduction of school crime, vandalism and disruptive behavior. The workshops have been provided to secondary school personnel by Peter Blauvelt of the Center for Improved Learning Environments. In the past, the workshops have emphasized positive strategies a school can implement to reduce the adverse effects school crime and disruptive behavior have upon the educational environment of a school. During the 1980-81 school year, two different types of workshops have been provided.

One of the models, titled "Incident Profiling Training," includes a half-day orientation briefing for superintendents, a two-day training program for key school personnel, and a final phase of on-site visits by consultants to assist schools in the project. A second model, "School Team Training," includes a one-day School Security Management Seminar for superintendents and school administrators and a second phase of training a school security team from each of the school district's secondary schools. A byproduct of this training experience is the development of a Security Action Plan by each participating school.

Another activity of the Missouri Department of Education has been the development of a Guide for School-Police-Juvenile Officer/Court Relations, released in January, 1981. The guide is intended to assist those involved in juvenile justice in working cooperatively and effectively with students in the public schools of Missouri. The guide suggests policies and procedures that may be used by school personnel in acting on juvenile problems which require the cooperation or intervention of police or juvenile authorities and attempts to describe the roles and responsibilities of each of those institutions regarding school-related juvenile justice issues.

A third activity of the Missouri Department of Education has been the sponsorship, along with the Danforth Foundation and the Missouri Division of Youth Services, of seminars on school climate improvement for administrators. The seminars were conducted by Eugene Howard of the Colorado Department of Education, along with Bill Stenson, a school administrator. School districts were invited to send three administrators from junior or senior high schools to the seminars, held in St. Louis and Kansas City. Those who wished to do so were offered the option of planning follow-up activities for the implementation of school climate improvement in their schools.

Nashville Public Schools

The Metro Nashville Public Schools have been implementing an ESAA project called "Positive Human Interaction" for the past several years. It is a multi-faceted effort, including activities for target students, parents of target students, entire faculties of target schools, and people within the school's community. The intent of the project is to bring about a stable and fully integrated school system through the improvement of school climate. Because of funding cuts, the number of target schools has been reduced to eight during 1981-82.

A concerted effort is being made to increase both the amount and quality of parent and citizen involvement in the target schools. The operation of parent and citizen volunteer programs is implemented where that appears to be viable. Personnel from target schools provide training for the parent and citizen volunteers in communication/interaction skills so that parents can reinforce the development of positive student self-concept and the skills necessary for successful adjustment to school.

The "Positive Human Interaction" Center provides opportunities for students to interact in small groups, where interaction is structured and specific interaction skills are taught. Sessions in the center include activities such as brainstorming to uncover specific likes/dislikes about the total school, brainstorming to uncover individual likes/dislikes that interfere with successful school performance in such areas as attendance, motivation, learning, peer acceptance; and developing strategies for dealing with the above-identified feelings and problems.

Student Advisory/Student Council Committees serve as a vehicle for gathering student reaction and input related to program activities, especially as they relate to problems associated with desegregation and the promotion of interracial appreciation.

The most encompassing effort toward school climate improvement in Metro Nashville Schools is the ongoing administrative staff development program. Recognizing the key role in school climate improvement that is played by principals, this program seeks to enhance their skills in the total area of organizational climate. Units representing each of five program areas (Interpersonal Relations, Management, Evaluation, Community Impact, and Self-Appraisal/Self-Renewal) are offered each year. Each administrator is expected to participate in a minimum of two core programs per year, representative of all program areas, over a period of five years. This system-wide effort to improve school climate supplements any local school climate improvement programs.

Wichita Public Schools

The continuing concern of Wichita Unified School District 259 for the improvement of school climate has resulted in a number of climate-related activities. Their Office of Staff Development has held workshops on Improving School Climate for forty-two building administrators and coordinators.

In the belief that race and sex desegregation efforts provide beneficial input to school/classroom climate improvement, the Office of Staff Development has also engaged in (1) a Race Desegregation Project with the goals (a) to provide special training in pluralism for public school personnel who have never worked in a totally desegregated school district, (b) to reduce the disproportionate number of secondary minority students suspended or expelled from school, and (c) to provide training for school district personnel in multiculturizing the curriculum; and (2) a Sex Desegregation Project with the goals (a) to assist school district personnel in assessing prevailing sex-role dominance patterns especially as that cultural reality influences the life options available to boys and girls, (b) to create an awareness of societal practices, policies, and programs which discriminate on the basis of sex, and (c) to reduce sex stereotyping and bias in every aspect of a student's acculturation through formal schooling.

The Murdock Teacher Center, developed in the Wichita District in 1974, also provides training in climate-related topics. During 1980-81, one of the most requested workshops, "Assertive Discipline Training," trained 323 teachers, affecting 5319 students. Nine elementary and two junior high schools finished the seven-session workshop, which required complete school implementation. That implementation will continue through the 1981-82 school year. Also in 1981-82, 140 more teachers from six additional elementary schools will be involved in this workshop, directly affecting another 2400 students.

RESEARCH-BASED STAFF DEVELOPMENT MATERIALS

The materials that follow are based on what research has to say about the principal's role as a leader in establishing and maintaining a school climate conducive to productivity and satisfaction.

Hardly anyone with an interest in schools disputes that the goal of schools is, or ought to be, to turn out students with the academic and personal achievement necessary to become productive, responsible citizens. Hardly anyone will dispute, either, that most individuals involved in schools have other goals in addition to, perhaps instead of, student benefit. Some of those goals, which may be entirely legitimate, have to do with meeting the personal needs of administrators and staff. It does not take research to tell us (although it does) that those who are dedicated to the goal of student achievement cannot long be expected to remain dedicated unless enough of their own needs (whether for income, appreciation, growth, or something else) are met in the process.

The materials that follow, then, are based on what research has to say about the principal's role as a leader in establishing and maintaining a school climate conducive to productivity and satisfaction. They look not only at what the principal can do to facilitate student learning but also at what s/he can do to meet enough of his/her own and others' personal needs so that the goal of student achievement can be attended to.

Specifically, the first fourteen pages of these materials constitute a set of activities which can be used by an individual principal as a sort of self-study and planning activity, but might be more productively completed in a workshop situation with some opportunity for help from a workshop leader and for individuals, after they have completed the surveys, to share ideas and discuss possibilities and plans with each other.

This set of materials is divided into three sections: assessing, clarifying, and planning. The following questions organize the sections:

Assessing

1. What can I contribute and how effectively am I contributing to the goal of student achievement, both directly by contact and interaction with students, and indirectly by enabling staff to do their jobs better?
2. What needs of mine must be met in order for me to stay focused on student productivity as a primary goal? Who needs to do what to "enable" me and how adequately are they doing it? What can I do to improve the situation if my needs aren't being met?

Clarifying

1. Which items am I most concerned to improve?
2. What specific changes do I want to make and what is required in order to make them?

Planning

1. What next steps can I take?
2. What goals am I setting for myself in relation to these next steps?

Following the set of materials described above, this section includes some additional materials which may be useful as handouts or transparencies for use in staff development situations. These are, in effect, summary sheets which show some of the major points covered in the paper.

ASSESSING

How effectively do I contribute to the goal of student achievement in my direct contacts with students?

	I'm satisfied with how well and how often I do this	I'm not satisfied with how I do this	I believe students are satisfied with how I do this
1. Verbally express to students my expectations that they can and will learn.			
2. Verbally or by actions express to students my expectations that they can and will behave in responsible ways.			
3. Verbally acknowledge to individual students or reward in other ways their exemplary academic performance.			
4. Verbally acknowledge to individual students or reward in other ways their exemplary effort to improve, even if they are not "high achievers" compared to others.			
5. Verbally acknowledge to individual students or reinforce in other ways their responsible behavior.			
6. Maintain a procedure for staying informed about students who deserve my commendation, so that I can do it "spontaneously" when I meet them in the halls, lunchroom, etc.			95
7. Interact frequently with students by making a point to be on the playground, in the cafeteria, in the halls, at times when they are there.			
8. Engage in what research calls both "indirect" and "direct" verbal behavior with students (making and accepting statements of feelings and opinions as well as stating decisions and criticisms).			
9. Set clear priorities for school activity and state the school goal of student achievement (especially in the basic skills) often and strongly enough so that students know I take it seriously.			

	I'm satisfied with how well and how often I do this	I'm not satisfied with how I do this	I believe students are satisfied with how I do this
10. Handle discipline problems in ways that least negatively affect the learning climate for all students.			
11. Set up and maintain clear procedures for student activity so that they know what is expected and can handle routine matters with a minimum of confusion.			
12. Set up and maintain procedures and structures for student participation and input into decisions about school operation that affect them.			
13. Know about cultural differences and take them into consideration in dealing with students.			

How effectively do I contribute to the goal of student achievement indirectly by helping teachers teach?

	I'm satisfied with how well and how often I do this	I'm not satisfied with how I do this	I believe teachers are satisfied with how I do this
1. Verbally express to teachers my expectations that they can and will teach well.			
2. Verbally express to teachers my expectations that students can and will learn.			
3. Verbally acknowledge to individual teachers or reward in other ways their exemplary efforts and performance.			
4. Set clear priorities for school activity and state the school goal of student achievement, especially in the basic skills, often and strongly enough so that teachers know I take it seriously.			
5. Verbally or by actions express to teachers my expectations that they will act responsibly--that they do not require coercion in order to do a good job.			
6. Model the behavior I expect from teachers and students--expect a lot of myself and work hard because I believe the goal of student achievement is important and I have a responsibility to help achieve it.			
7. Set norms/practices for collegiality and continuous improvement of practice by verbalizing my expectations for shared work and shared talk about the teaching/learning process and by modeling that behavior myself.			
8. Maintain norms/practices for collegiality and continuous improvement of practice by participating actively in discussions with staff about ways to improve teaching, by treating staff as colleagues rather than "inferiors" (welcoming their contribution to aims, perspectives, methods), supporting staff working together for improvement by the way I make assignments, schedules, budgets.			

	I'm satisfied with how well and how often I do this	I'm not satisfied with how I do this	I believe teachers are satisfied with how I do this
9. State critiques in terms of the usefulness/success of specific practices, rather than as condemnations of teachers using the practices.			
10. Teach and am comfortable having staff observe me teaching.			
11. Defend/protect staff who engage in collegial and experimental efforts to improve instruction from criticism/interference of those who do not, both from within and outside the school.			
12. Build on the strengths of staff (which means that I can identify strengths of each staff person).			
13. Conduct my classroom visits in ways that help rather than hinder teaching and learning.			
14. Set up/maintain well-defined, clear routine procedures so that staff knows how to take care of such things as reporting, ordering supplies, referring students, etc. and can do it with a minimum of wasted energy.			
15. Keep staff paper-work related to administration as brief and easy as possible.			
16. Facilitate staff meetings and discussions as productively as possible by staying focused on the subject at hand and making sure that there is equal opportunity for expression, so that more verbal group members are not allowed to dominate.			
17. Listen attentively and responsively to staff and, when in doubt, check verbally to be sure I have understood what they intended to tell me.			
18. Solicit teacher input into decisions that affect them, such as selection of materials, placement of students, reporting procedures, scheduling.			

	I'm satisfied with how well and how often I do this	I'm not satisfied with how I do this	I believe teachers are satisfied with how I do this
19. When I feel that I must make a decision without input or contrary to input from those affected by it, I give them my reasons for acting that way.			
20. Support teachers on matters of student discipline and do all that I can to discourage and change student behavior that is disruptive to a learning environment.			
21. Refrain from interrupting classroom activity with intercom announcements, personal appearances to discuss administrative matters, and the like.			
22. Attend meetings having to do with curriculum planning and participate actively in designing and evaluating curriculum without dominating that activity.			
23. Risk opposing "the system" if necessary in order to get materials and resources that teachers need.			
24. Delegate to teachers those things that they know how to do better than I do.			
25. Provide low-risk feedback mechanisms to find out to what degree teachers perceive me helping them to teach better and/or what they would like from me that I'm not providing.			

In order for me to stay focused on student achievement as my school's primary goal, my own professional and personal needs must be met to some degree. How adequately is this happening?

	I'm satisfied with how this is happening	I'm dissatisfied with how this is happening
1. Central office administration demonstrates that they are aware of and appreciative of my competence.		
2. To the degree that they can, central office administrators provide resources and support for my and my staff's efforts at school improvement.		
3. Teachers express appreciation for my work.		
4. Teachers cooperate willingly with my recommendations and projects.		
5. Students express appreciation for my work or show their respect/admiration in some way.		
6. Parents express appreciation for my work.		
7. I'm given the opportunities for professional growth and training that I feel I need.		
8. I have enough sources of help available when I need to solve a problem, whether personal or professional.		
9. Family and friends love, appreciate and support me.		
10. I feel enthusiastic about my work; it isn't just something I do because I need to earn a living--I do it because I genuinely feel that it is worthwhile.		
11. I feel as challenged by my work as I need to be to keep from being bored or complacent.		
12. I feel genuinely optimistic about students in my school achieving; I don't think my efforts are futile.		

	I'm satisfied with how this is happening	I'm dissatisfied with how this is happening
13. I can point to enough indicators of my success to feel that I am productive.		
14. When I'm in a conflict situation, whether personal or professional, other people involved are generally willing to help find a mutually satisfactory solution.		
15. I have opportunities to spend time in activities I enjoy that are not work-related.		
16. There is a good balance of professional and personal satisfaction in my life.		
17. There is a good balance of seriousness and humor in my life.		

After you have completed the checklists, summarize your responses in the space below:

I. The areas in which I'm not satisfied with my direct contacts with students have to do with:

______ my verbal behavior

______ my goal and priority setting

______ my management of discipline problems

______ my management of procedures for routine student activity

______ my provisions for student input into decisions affecting them

______ my knowledge of students' cultural differences

II. The areas in which I'm not satisfied with how I help teachers to teach have to do with:

______ my verbal behavior

______ my goal and priority setting

______ my modeling of behavior I want from others

______ my norms/practices relative to collegiality and continuous improvement of practice

______ my teaching ability

______ my knowledge of staff strengths

______ my conduct of classroom visits

______ my management of procedures for routine teacher activity

______ my conduct of staff meetings

______ my listening behavior

______ my provisions for teacher input into decisions affecting them

______ my management of discipline problems

______ my interruptions of classroom activity

______ my performance relative to curriculum planning

______ my skill at dealing with "the system"

______ my ability to delegate responsibility

______ my skill at dealing with parents/community

______ my access to feedback from teachers

III. The areas in which my own needs are not adequately met have to do with:

______ others' verbal behavior

______ my opportunities for professional training

______ support from family and friends

______ lack of enthusiasm for my job

______ lack of challenge from my work

______ my pessimism about student achievement

______ insufficient sense of success/productivity in my job

______ others' behavior toward me in conflict situations

______ my leisure activities

______ the balance of professional/personal satisfaction in my life

______ the balance of seriousness/humor in my life

Now list on the lines below the two or three items from each list (I, II, and III) that most concern you:

I. 1. ____________________

2. ____________________

3. ____________________

II. 1. ____________________

2. ____________________

3. ____________________

III. 1. ____________________

2. ____________________

3. ____________________

Now rank order your concerns, with 1 being the item you think most important for you to improve (this exercise assumes that, even in the case where others are not adequately meeting your needs, you can do something to influence that situation for the better).

1. ________
2. ________
3. ________
4. ________
5. ________
6. ________
7. ________
8. ________
9. ________

CLARIFYING

Analyze each of the top three items on your list by answering the following series of questions. (NOTE: If this series of questions does not fit some of the items from list III, use the Alternative Series which follows).

ITEM 1. Specifically, what I want to do (not what I want to be) differently is

____.

The reason I am not doing it as well as I'd like now is __________________________

____.

(Most reasons generalize into one of two categories: "I don't know how to," or "I don't want to." Does your answer fall into one of those categories?).

What I need in order to do it better is ____

____.

ITEM 2. Specifically, what I want to do (not what I want to be) differently is

____.

The reason I am not doing it as well as I'd like now is __________________________

____.

What I need in order to do it better is ____

____.

ITEM 3. Specifically, what I want to do (not what I want to be) differently is

____.

The reason I am not doing it as well as I'd like now is __________________________

____.

What I need in order to do it better is ____

____.

ALTERNATIVE SERIES of questions for items from list III:

1. Specifically, what I want others to do (not what I want them to be) differently

is ____.

The reason they are not doing it as well as I'd like now probably is ____________

____.

Do I do anything that may contribute to their not doing it? If so, what?

____.

What needs to happen in order for them to do it probably is ____________________

____.

2. Specifically, what I want others to do (not what I want them to be) differently

is ____.

The reason they are not doing it as well as I'd like now probably is ____________

____.

Do I do anything that may contribute to their not doing it? If so, what?

____.

What needs to happen in order for them to do it probably is ____________________

____.

3. Specifically, what I want others to do (not what I want them to be) differently

is ____.

The reason they are not doing it as well as I'd like now probably is ____________

____.

Do I do anything that may contribute to their not doing it? If so, what?

____.

What needs to happen in order for them to do it probably is ____________________

____.

PLANNING

You have just identified what you need, or what you believe needs to happen, in order for you to improve the items to which you gave highest priority for change. Of course the more difficult problem is likely to be how to get what is needed.

One encouraging factor is that an analysis of the items on the checklists reveals that, for most of them, what is needed for improvement is not additional funds. Most of them can be improved through additional information, skill, and/or motivation on someone's part.

This is not to imply that information, skill and motivation are easily come by; indeed, it is very difficult to get information if what you need is something that no one seems to have, such as a foolproof way to handle all discipline problems. It is perhaps even harder to get motivation if you simply do not feel any. Motivation may also depend on your access to certain kinds of information, such as evidence that it is possible to achieve a desired result, or evidence that someone is interested in your efforts and cares about their results.

The questions on this page and those that follow are intended to help you clarify and plan next steps you can take to get what is needed for improvement.

List below your answers from the preceding pages to the questions, "what I need in order to do it better is" ____

____

____

or "what needs to happen in order for them to do it probably is" __________

____

____.

Your answers may have already made clear what next steps you can take to improve the items you chose. That would be true, for instance, if what you needed was simply to be more aware that you want to increase the number of times you make certain kinds of verbal statements to students or staff. Other answers may not so easily imply how they can be implemented. For those that do not, it may be helpful to answer the following question:

ITEM: Who ____ could do
(could be yourself)

____
(what)

____
(when and where, if applicable)

to bring about what is needed. If the person in your answer is not yourself, is there something you can do to influence him/her to do what needs doing? If so, what? ____.

ITEM: Who ______________________________ could do
(could be yourself)

____
(what)

____
(when and where, if applicable)

to bring about what is needed. If the person in your answer is not yourself, is there something you can do to influence him/her to do what needs doing? If so, what? ______________________________.

ITEM: Who ______________________________ could do
(could be yourself)

____
(what)

____
(when and where, if applicable)

to bring about what is needed. If the person in your answer is not yourself, is there something you can do to influence him/her to do what needs doing? If so, what? ______________________________.

NOTE: At this point you may find it productive to discuss your answers with another person or small group of persons to see if they can suggest alternative next steps that you may not have thought of.

If you find yourself able to come up with several apparently reasonable steps that you can take to get what you need but you find that you have little desire to take them, it may help to analyze your reluctance by answering the following questions:

What am I thinking about this "next step" that keeps me from wanting to take it?

______________________________.

What might make me think and feel differently about it? ______________________________

______________________________.

Could it "work" if I did it even though I am reluctant to try it?

______________________________.

SUMMARY

ITEM 1: The next step(s) I am going to take to improve this item is

____.

I will do it by ____.
(date)

My indicator(s) that I have improved this item sufficiently will be

____

____

ITEM 2: The next step(s) I am going to take to improve this item is

____.

I will do it by ____.
(date)

My indicator(s) that I have improved this item sufficiently will be

____

____

ITEM 3: The next step(s) I am going to take to improve this item is

____

I will do it by ____.
(date)

My indicator(s) that I have improved this item sufficiently will be

____

____.

SUMMARY SHEETS - MAJOR POINTS

THE PRINCIPAL WHO LEADS IN THE CREATION AND MAINTENANCE OF A PRODUCTIVE AND SATISFYING SCHOOL CLIMATE ...

(1) TAKES INITIATIVE

"The principal...is likely to be held accountable for 60% or more of what is or is not occurring."

(2) USES A DECISION-MAKING PROCESS WHICH INVOLVES INPUT FROM THOSE AFFECTED BY THE DECISION

"Educational innovation does not succeed unless the schools' faculty and staff agree that it is important enough to merit their devotion of energy and resources--unless, in other words, they assume 'ownership' of the effort."

(3) DEMONSTRATES CONSIDERATION FOR THOSE WITH WHOM S/HE WORKS (INCLUDING STUDENTS)

"A focus on practices as distinct from teachers helps to preserve self-respect and eliminate barriers to discussion; the utility of a practice is thus separated from the competence of a teacher."

(4) COMMUNICATES OPENLY AND ENCOURAGES OTHERS TO DO SO

"This presupposes that the principal feels sufficiently comfortable and competent not to be threatened by criticism and can see occasional conflicts of viewpoint as opportunities for individual and organizational renewal."

(5) ESTABLISHES AND MAINTAINS WELL-DEFINED STRUCTURES

"While the leader may need to live with ambiguity, s/he diminishes it for others by setting up clear procedures and practices that help people get things done with a minimum of confusion."

(6) USES A LOGICAL, CLEAR PROBLEM-SOLVING PROCESS

"S/he seeks information rather than hearsay, knows how to look for alternative solutions and how to evaluate results systematically. S/he does not try to solve all problems singlehandedly. S/he can delegate responsibility."

(7) DEMONSTRATES AND COMMUNICATES HIGH EXPECTATIONS FOR SELF AND OTHERS

"One cannot have either a sense of complacency or a sense of futility and still provide leadership in a significant way."

INDICATORS OF GOOD SCHOOL CLIMATE SUGGESTED BY RESEARCH

1. Clear expectations by teachers that all students can be taught and none will fall below minimum levels of achievement
2. Expectations by students that they can learn, and a perception by students that their efforts control their achievement
3. Tendency on the part of staff to treat students equivalently rather than dividing them by ability
4. Adherence to mastery learning concepts
5. Acquisition of basic skills takes precedence over other school activities
6. Tendency to use cooperative team learning techniques to promote peer instruction, motivation, and integration
7. Frequent monitoring of pupil progress in relationship to instructional objectives--greater reliance on achievement test data as prescriptive
8. Orderly, relatively quiet, well-structured milieu conducive to maximum academic engaged time
9. Strong leadership from administration; involvement of principal in the instructional program
10. Staff norms for collegial work and continuous improvement
11. Recognition for achievement and positive behavior
12. Parent involvement and reinforcement of expectations for student achievement

SUGGESTED COMPONENTS OF THE SCHOOL CLIMATE IMPROVEMENT PROCESS

1. Assess need for change and readiness for change.
2. Select person for leadership responsibility who has credibility with people who will be affected by the effort.
3. Determine that adequate time and resources are available to allow a successful effort.
4. Build ownership of the effort by those affected--this involves allowing sufficient discussion to thoroughly explore the issues and come to agreement about whether and how to undertake the project.
5. Plan the process by which the effort will occur.
6. Collect baseline data (or analyze existing data).
7. Choose no more than three target topics for improvement.
8. Specify desired outcomes; success is likelier if these outcomes are congruent with district goals.
9. Identify resources.
10. Establish timelines.
11. Plan strategies.
12. Plan for communication with and involvement of concerned audiences.
13. Plan for formative and summative evaluations.
14. Implement plans.
15. Conduct progress reviews at appropriate intervals and revise plans as necessary.

CAUTIONS TO BE CONSIDERED IN ASSESSING THE LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS OF A SCHOOL CLIMATE IMPROVEMENT EFFORT

UNLESS ....

1. the initiator of the effort has credibility with those who are expected to participate, there is very little probability that it will succeed.

2. there is at least less than 80% level of satisfaction with things as they are, an improvement effort is not likely to have noticeable effect.

3. the people to be involved make a voluntary commitment to participate and assume "ownership" of the project, success is unlikely.

4. the motive for beginning the project is to help participants become more productive and satisfied, as opposed to an intent to discredit or expose the unproductive and dissatisfied, expect little success.

5. there are sufficient resources of money, material, personnel, and time (at least two years) available to justify realistic expectations of success, the project is probably better postponed. An effort begun prematurely may do more harm than good if it sets up expectations that cannot be fulfilled.

6. there are some incentives for the people who are expected to do most of the work (perhaps academic or inservice credit, public acknowledgment, etc.) their enthusiasm is likely to wane.

7. the effort is limited to manageable proportions--no more than three major concerns should be dealt with at one time--chances for success are lessened appreciably.

8. objectives of an improvement project are expressed in terms of both product and process, evaluation is likely to be difficult.

9. objectives are consistent with those of the school district from the board of education on down to the school building staff, it is likely that it will be difficult to obtain the support and resources necessary for success.

UNLESS ....

10. the initiator(s) of the improvement project know and acknowledge both the strengths and the weaknesses of research relative to the proposed innovation, the effort may be killed by an overenthusiastic push that eventually discredits it.

11. there is continuing interaction between the people most active in the effort and the larger school community, support is likely to be difficult to maintain.

12. the change process builds in a review of planning at various stages of the project, focus is likely to shift from desired outcomes to implementing someone's pet idea.

13. some quick, visible benefits are experienced by those participating, motivation may decrease even though they realize that success of the overall project may take two or three years.

QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER
WHEN CHOOSING A SCHOOL CLIMATE ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT

1. Do you want to measure satisfaction, productivity, or both?

2. Do you have already collected data (student attendance, achievement, etc.) which may be of more use than formal assessment with a school climate instrument?

3. Do you want high-inference ("What does this mean?") or low-inference ("How many?") responses? Low-inference instruments are more prevalent, but substantially less valid in predicting learning outcomes.

4. If you are measuring attitudes, is the instrument multidimensional so that it will reflect affective, cognitive, and behavioral components and take context into account?

5. Have levels of reliability, validity, and concurrent or predictive validity with other measures been established?

6. Can the instrument be completed with the time and energy likely to be available for the assessment process?

7. Can the results be "scored" and interpreted easily, promptly, economically?

PLANNERS OF INSERVICE FOR PRINCIPALS SHOULD TAKE INTO ACCOUNT...

1. the principal's need to cope with a fragmented, stressful job requiring constant interaction with people of different ages, backgrounds, educational experience, language patterns, and roles.

2. the principal's responsibility to provide instructional leadership.

3. that awareness is not sufficient to insure application of new understandings in practice.

4. that most administrators polled preferred being trained by other administrators.

5. that an effective approach has been to tie the principal's personal development goals to specific school improvement goals.

6. that "quick solution" training is of little use unless the principal is part of an on-going collaborative support group.

7. that use of cooperative learning groups during inservice helps to facilitate learning and motivation.

THE PRINCIPAL AS INSTRUCTIONAL LEADER

- ....provides teachers, to the degree possible, the conditions and resources necessary to support their efforts for instructional improvement.
  - ....reduces classroom interruptions.
  - ....backs teacher requests for discipline of students whose behavior interferes with learning.
  - ....maximizes scheduling flexibility to permit teachers to visit other schools and classes to observe skilled colleagues
  - ....uses budget to purchase materials teachers deem necessary
  - ....makes requests for additional support from the district office when necessary
  - ....defends staff from "outside" pressure for premature or simplistic evaluation of new programs and from criticism of their efforts.

- ....is thoroughly knowledgeable about any innovation s/he expects teachers to implement.
  - ....knows the research on which the innovation is based well enough to be able to acknowledge both its strengths and limitations
  - ....knows what skills the innovation requires of teachers and provides inservice for the various levels of skill development needed.
  - ....knows and "owns" with teachers the problems involved in implementing the innovation.

....builds institutional ownership of proposed changes before attempting to implement them.

- ....develops decision-making structures that allow for open and thorough discussion and decision to adopt or reject any proposed innovation by those who will be affected by it.

....sets and maintains norms for collegial work and continuous improvement of practice.

- ....states expectations for shared work, shared talk, frank review of practice and investigation of alternatives among teachers
- ....models reciprocity and interdependence--engages with staff in mutual contribution to aims, perspectives, methods.
- ....uses resources/rewards related to release time, consultants, schedules, assignments, budget, etc. to demonstrate commitment to these norms.
- ....focuses on evaluation of practices as distinct from teachers --helps to preserve self-respect and eliminate barriers to discussion by separating the utility of a practice from the competence of a teacher.

APPENDIX A

Information from the National Institute of Education about Current Research Activity Related to the Principalship

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20208

October 1981

Dear Colleagues:

It is a pleasure to write and bring you up to date on activities concerning the principalship, as a great deal has happened since I last wrote in March. The mailing list has doubled, thanks to your own enthusiastic responses to the earlier letter: many have written or called here to talk about work in progress, and others have passed word to colleagues. As a result, the "community of interest" has grown to be over 200 people.

One of the truly exciting aspects of my work has been to learn about your activity and to respond to requests to know of others with common or related interests. If the mailing address we have for you should be changed, or if you would rather not have it included in a general list, please let me know; in a few months I'll send each of you the list of all who are part of our network.

Here are some of the exciting things that have been happening in the last few months, touching first on some NIE-sponsored research:

- Chicago study finished. The research team at University of Illinois--Chicago Circle has completed their study of The Urban Principal: Discretionary Decision-Making in a Large Educational Organization (the team included Van Cleve Morris, Bob Crowson, Cynthia Porter-Gehrie, Emmanuel Hurwitz). This ethnographic study logged hundreds of hours of field observations on 16 Chicago principals, and yields a solid and comprehensive description of how each principal worked, how each shaped a school and their particular role in the school, and how each negotiated with an environment of community and larger hierarchy. (A book contract is being negotiated, so you will have the study in a form for adoption for use in class, for the library, etc. in due course; if you would like to order a copy of the final report now, use the enclosed form and return it directly to the authors.)

- Lortie study moving along. Dan Lortie and a team at University of Chicago are in the final stages of analysis of data drawn from lengthy interviews with hundreds of Chicago-area elementary principals. The data allows exploration of the principal's world from his or her own perspective: the nature of the job, its demands and rewards, the kinds of control experienced from superiors, patterns of movement into the job and socialization into its routines, and much more. For those who know Lortie's earlier comprehensive analysis of teaching in the book Schoolteacher, the report of this work on principals is eagerly awaited.

- Selection study completes first year, begins second. Catherine Baltzell and Robert Dentler at Abt Associates spent 1980-81 in the field in districts all over the nation studying current practices of selection of principals. Now in 1981-82 they are again in the field, looking at innovations that will strengthen and improve selection and assignment. An early report was given at the 1981 AERA meeting, at a symposium which included people from the other projects mentioned above.

- Far West Laboratory begins "Instructional Management" project. As part of its NIE-funded portfolio, Far West Lab has brought Steve Bossert from Michigan to join the Lab and initiate a program of R&D to derive from classroom and learning research some implications for how principals should work as "instructional managers." Bossert has in turn hired Brian Rowan and David Dwyer as part of his team, and they have been at work reviewing past work and looking forward to new activity in 1982. They commissioned four informal papers on aspects of their general mandate (by Barry Anderson, Don Erickson, Tom Good, and Van Cleve Morris and Bob Crowson) and held a small working conference in October, as well as trying out some ideas with Bay Area principals.

- Oregon Center continues to develop training designs. As part of NIE's effort to reach administrators with the best of current research, we sponsor the University of Oregon's Center for Educational Policy and Management, working with the associations of school administrators in California, Oregon, and Washington. Following California's tested "Project Leadership" design, Oregon researchers are plugging a lot of new research into the curriculum for principals' staff development sessions in each state, with numerous pilot events held in 1980-81, and to continue in the current year.

- Literature reviews completed on women and minorities in the principalship. An NIE contractor completed these and copies have been widely distributed. Based on the research literature, and on statistical data sources, the two reviews give a picture of the sheer numbers of people in the principalship, and the demographics of women and minorities in particular, as well as reviewing explanations and interpretations offered in the literature, and remedies. Copies are available from NIE.

- Pilot test of audio-tape magazine-format for reaching principals. To a pilot audience of 450 elementary principals, NIE mailed at the start of this school year an experimental cassette tape and print package. Focussed on the subject of school discipline, the tape included interviews with researchers and principals on effective ways to use codes of rules as part of a school conduct program. Print materials in the package included a sample code, a discipline needs assessment, follow-up information and bibliography. NIE will use the results of this test, done in cooperation with the National Association of Elementary School Principals, to assess the market and feasibility of doing more such information dissemination packages in tape format, to reach busy educators. (To borrow a copy, write us; we have only one or two sets left after distributing the pilot test copies, so we cannot offer copies to keep, unfortunately.)

And of course, as you know, there is a great deal happening quite apart from NIE sponsorship, through district and state efforts, university and foundation activity, and through associations. With so much going on, and so much interest in principals, we have decided to use our resources to help gain an overview, to pull together what is known (and unknown), what ideas are ready for action, and what next steps for research and practice emerge from the current state of knowledge.

As a start, we have asked several people to look at particular kinds of literature and assess what's known in each of four areas. The paper topics and authors, and areas of literature to be examined are as follows:

"Empirical research on principals" -- William Greenfield, Department of Educational Administration, Kent State University.

Will review and analyze research (including unpublished materials such as dissertations not covered in the review in Greenfield and Blumberg, The Effective Principal) aimed directly at study of principals.

"The principal makes a difference" -- Caroline Persell, Department of Sociology, New York University.

Will review research which began by studying other subjects but which concluded that the principal was important to understanding the topic. Tentative areas to be included: effective schools, change, desegregation.

"A view of the principal from the world of practice" -- Roland Barth and Terry Deal, Program in Administration, Harvard Graduate School of Education.

Review of practitioner journals and pre-service training textbooks, to summarize the lore of practice and its self-image--perhaps a more reliable, richer, or more interesting picture than that from research?

"A critical review of literature on leadership and mid-management, and its potential applications to school principals" -- Gary Yukl, Department of Management, School of Business, State University of New York at Albany.

A look at literature from outside education, but which talks about a role potentially very similar to the principalship -- managers in the middle in other sectors. Have others found effective ways to cope?

These papers will be done by the end of this year, and we hope to use them as departure points at a small, state-of-the-art meeting in the first half of 1982, to aim at influence over action in research, training, and other settings touching on the principalship. Specific plans for the meeting are tentative, because of the much-reduced Institute budget for the 1981-82 fiscal year, which will allow few, if any, new activities of any kind.

We are most pleased, however, that Harold Howe II, former U.S. Commissioner of Education and Ford Foundation official, now at Harvard Graduate School of Education and current chair of NIE's policy-making National Council on Educational Research, has agreed to chair the meeting, and has been involved in plans so far. We of course hope to gather the papers, the discussion, and one or more summary essays into book form for wider use. And we are looking ahead to a series of meetings in different parts of the country hosted by local organizations or associations or LEAs and SEAs, to explore the implications of the overview and synthesis.

As a start, we recently designed a two-day review of the state of the art for a sub-group of NIE's Urban Superintendents' Network -- including heads of New York, Chicago, and other major systems. The topic was clearly high on their agenda of concerns, so the research and analytic community has a ready audience!

As I mentioned at the start, there is much else happening, and we hope to share more news with you in the next letter. Among the items that have crossed the desk in recent weeks, showing the ferment and creativity in this field, and the importance of the work, are:

- Announcement of the opening of a "Principals' Center" at Harvard Graduate School of Education -- designed to meet the special training and support needs of this group;

- Nearly-completed research by a group headed by psychologist Neil Schmitt at Michigan State University on the important application of the assessment center used in business management selection to principal selection, as developed by the National Association of Secondary Principals;

- Strong comments on the central role of the principal, in opening speech by incoming Boston Superintendent Robert Spillane, as he vowed to work in increase the resources and support -- and the expectations -- for principals;

- Continuing controversy in New York City over the most effective methods for selecting principals, touching on familiar issues of equity, the power of tests in predicting behavior, and the practicality of using more complex screening tools;

- Draft of literature review on school-site-level management, to appear in next volume of AERA's Review of Research in Education, authored by Bill Boyd and Bob Crowson; review of data on sex equity in teaching and administration positions, as part of overall review of Title IX progress, in report of National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs, Title IX: The Half Full, Half Empty Glass; review of women in administration generally, by Judith Adkison in latest issue of Review of Educational Research.

I'm sure you can extend this list five-fold from your own reading and personal contacts. I know we share a concern to bring the best of research and development to bear on school improvement in the 1980s.

Please continue to let me know of your work by phone, letter, and visits. I will keep you posted as our own activities go forward.

With every good wish,

Sincerely,

A. Lorri Manasse

A. Lorri Manasse
NIE Associate
School Management and
Organization Studies

Enclosure